arXiv:1612.05541v1 [math.PR] 16 Dec 2016

APPROXIMATION AND SIMULATION OF INFINITE-DIMENSIONAL LÉVY PROCESSES

ANDREA BARTH AND ANDREAS STEIN

Abstract. In this paper approximation methods for infinite-dimensional Lévy processes, also called (time-dependent) Lévy fields, are introduced. For square integrable fields beyond the Gaussian case, it is no longer given that the one-dimensional distributions in the spectral representation with respect to the covariance operator are independent. When simulated via a Karhunen-Loève expansion a correlated set of one-dimensional Lévy processes has to be generated. This ensures that the resulting field exhibits the correct marginal distributions. To approximate the respective (one-dimensional) Lévy-measures, a numerical method, called discrete Fourier inversion, is developed. In contrast to other methods, such as the compound Poisson approximation, L^p-convergence rates can be obtained. Under certain regularity assumptions mean square convergence of the approximated field is proven. Further, a class of (time-dependent) Lévy fields is introduced, where the marginal distributions are subordinated Wiener processes. For this specific class one may derive marginal distributions in closed form. Numerical examples, which include hyperbolic and normal-inverse Gaussian fields, demonstrate the efficiency of the approach.

1. Introduction

Uncertainty quantification plays an increasingly important role in a wide range of problems in the Engineering Sciences and Physics. Examples of sources of uncertainty are imprecise or insufficient measurements and noisy data. In the underlying dynamical system this is modeled via a stochastic operator, stochastic boundary conditions and/or stochastic data. As an example, to model subsurface flow more realistically the coefficients of an (essentially) elliptic equation are assumed to be stochastic. A common approach in the literature is to use correlated random fields that are built from uniform distributions or colored log-normal fields. The resulting marginal distributions of the field are (shifted) normally, resp. log-normally distributed. Neither choice is universal enough to accommodate all possible types of porosity, especially not if fractures are incorporated (see [30]). In some applications it might even be necessary that the marginal distribution of the (time-dependent) random field is a pure-jump process (see [7]).

In the case of a (time-dependent) Gaussian random field, the approximation and simulation via its Karhunen-Loève (KL) expansion is straightforward. Almost sure and L^p-convergence in terms of the decay of the eigenvalues has been shown for truncated KL-expansions in [8]. For infinite-dimensional Lévy processes, also called *Lévy fields*, the approximation may still be attempted via the KL expansions. In contrast to the Gaussian case, the one-dimensional processes in the spectral representation are not independent but merely uncorrelated. If

Key words and phrases. Infinite-dimensional Lévy processes, Karhunen-Loève expansion, subordinated processes, stochastic partial differential equations.

The research leading to these results has received funding from the German Research Foundation (DFG) as part of the Cluster of Excellence in Simulation Technology (EXC 310/2) at the University of Stuttgart and by the Juniorprofessorship program of Baden–Württemberg, and it is gratefully acknowledged.

one were to use independent Lévy processes, the resulting field would not have the desired marginal distributions and would, therefore, not converge to the desired Lévy field. One may circumvent this issue by the use of correlated processes. To this end, one of the main contributions of this paper is to introduce a class of Lévy processes that can be expressed in terms of subordinated Brownian motions and derive the corresponding correlation structure. From a simulatory point of view this entails the generation of a certain number of one-dimensional processes with a given set of parameters. To account for the specific structure of the subordinated Brownian motions we introduce a second approach, where we generate one multidimensional process with decorrelated marginals.

In both aforementioned cases it is, however, necessary to simulate one-dimensional Lévy processes. A common way to to do so, is to employ the so called *compound Poisson approximation* (CPA) (see [1],[27] and [29]). Although it is possible to achieve convergence in distribution of the approximation, it is in general not possible to derive mean-square convergence results and obtain error bounds in terms of the approximation parameters. As a further contribution in this paper we develop a novel approximation method for one-dimensional Lévy processes. This new approach, based on Fourier inversion, addresses the abovementioned problems. We prove L^p- and almost surely convergence of the approximation under relatively weak assumptions and derive precise error bounds. We show, mean-square convergence of the approximation to a given infinite-dimensional Lévy process by combining the Fourier inversion method with an appropriate truncation of the KL expansion.

As a class of subordinated processes, we consider *generalized hyperbolic (GH) Lévy processes*, that are based on the generalized hyperbolic distribution and cover for example *normal inverse Gaussian* (NIG) and *hyperbolic* processes. These processes are widely used in applications such as mathematical Finance, Physics and Biology (see, for instance, [2, 7, 10, 13, 14]). With its fat-tailed distribution a GH-field may also be of value in the modeling of subsurface flows (see [30] for a discussion on fat-tailed distributions).

We approximate the corresponding GH Lévy fields via truncated KL expansions with GH-distributed marginals and show that the approximation converges to an infinite-dimensional GH process. By the fact that GH Lévy processes can be represented as subordinated Brownian motions we are able to simulate GH fields efficiently using the Fourier inversion method, even if a large number of one-dimensional GH processes is necessary.

This article is structured as follows: Section 2 contains preliminaries on Lévy processes taking values in Hilbert spaces and the main convergence theorem for the approximation. In Section 3, we present a new approach for the approximation of one-dimensional Lévy processes by Fourier inversion and prove L^p- and almost sure convergence. We proceed by investigating the class of GH Lévy processes and state the necessary conditions for the approximated field to be itself GH distributed. In Section 5, we remark on some implementational details of the algorithm and conclude with NIG- and hyperbolic fields as numerical examples.

2. Preliminaries

Throughout this paper, we consider a time interval $\mathbb{T} := [0, T]$, with $T > 0$, and a filtered probability space $(\Omega, (\mathcal{F}_t, t \geq 0), \mathbb{P})$ satisfying the usual conditions. A Lévy process taking values in a separable Hilbert space $(H, (\cdot, \cdot)_H)$ is defined as follows (see [24]):

Definition 2.1. A H-valued stochastic process $L = (L(t), t \in \mathbb{T})$ is called Lévy process if

- L has stationary and independent increments,
- $L(0) = 0$ $\mathbb{P}$-almost surely and

- L is stochastically continuous, i.e. if for all $\varepsilon > 0$ and $t \in \mathbb{T}$ holds
$$\lim_{s \to t, s \in \mathbb{T}} \mathbb{P}(||L(t) - L(s)||_H > \varepsilon) = 0.$$

The characteristic function of a Lévy process is then given by the *Lévy-Khintchine formula*:
$$\mathbb{E}[\exp(i(h, L(t))_H)] = \exp(t\Psi_L(h)), \quad \text{for } h \in H,$$
where
$$\Psi_L(h) = i(\iota_H, h)_H - \frac{1}{2}(\Sigma_H h, h)_H + \int_H \exp(i(h,y)_H) - 1 - i(h,y)_H \mathbf{1}_{||y||_H<1} \nu_H(dy) \tag{2.1}$$
(see [24, Thm. 4.27]). In Eq (2.1), $\iota_H \in H$, Σ_H is a symmetric, non-negative and nuclear operator on H and ν_H is a non-negative measure on H satisfying
$$\nu_H(\{0\}) = 0 \quad \text{and} \quad \int_H \min(1, ||y||_H^2)\, \nu(dy) < \infty.$$
The triplet $(\iota_H, \Sigma_H, \nu_H)$ is unique for every Lévy process L and called the *characteristic triplet*. For the special case of a one-dimensional Lévy process $\ell = (\ell(t), t \in \mathbb{T})$, the Lévy-Khintchine formula simplifies to
$$\mathbb{E}[\exp(iu\ell(t))] = \exp\left(t(\iota u i - \frac{\sigma^2}{2}u^2 + \int_{\mathbb{R}} \exp(iuy) - 1 - iuy\mathbf{1}_{|y|<1} d\nu(y))\right), \quad u \in \mathbb{R}, \tag{2.2}$$
where $\iota \in \mathbb{R}$, $\sigma^2 > 0$ and ν is a measure on $\mathbb{R}$ satisfying
$$\nu(\{0\}) = 0 \quad \text{and} \quad \int_{\mathbb{R}} \min(1, y^2)\nu(dy) < \infty,$$
see for instance [6] or [28]. The notation ℓ is introduced for finite-dimensional Lévy processes to have a clear distinction from the (possibly infinite-dimensional) Lévy process L.

If W is a H-valued Lévy process with characteristic triplet $(0, \Sigma_H, 0)$, then W is called Σ_H-*Wiener process*. Since Σ_H is symmetric, non-negative and nuclear (see Eq. (2.1)) it admits, by the Hilbert-Schmidt theorem, the spectral decomposition
$$\Sigma_H \hat{e}_i = \hat{\rho}_i \hat{e}_i.$$
Here, $((\hat{\rho}_i, \hat{e}_i), i \in \mathbb{N})$ is the sequence of eigenpairs of Σ_H, where the eigenvalues $\hat{\rho}_i$ are positive with zero as their only accumulation point and the sequence $(\hat{e}_i, i \in \mathbb{N})$ forms an orthonormal basis of H. For convenience, we assume that the sequence of eigenvalues $(\hat{\rho}_i, i \in \mathbb{N})$ is given in decaying order. The Σ_H-Wiener process W admits then a unique expansion (also called Karhunen–Loève expansion)
$$W(t) = \sum_{i \in \mathbb{N}} \sqrt{\hat{\rho}_i} \hat{e}_i w_i(t),$$
where $(w_i, i \in \mathbb{N})$ is a sequence of independent, one-dimensional, real-valued Brownian motions. An obvious way to approximate W is therefore given by the truncated series
$$W_N(t) := \sum_{i=1}^{N} \sqrt{\hat{\rho}_i} \hat{e}_i w_i(t).$$
It can be shown that the approximations $(W_N, N \in \mathbb{N})$ converge in $L^2(\Omega; H)$ and almost surely to the Σ_H-Wiener process W (see for instance [9]). For the approximation of general (non-continuous) processes L, we aim to apply a similar approach. We assume L is square-integrable, as otherwise L does not admit a KL expansion. A H-valued stochastic process

$(L(t), t \in [0,T])$ is said to be square-integrable if $||L(t)||_{L^2(\Omega;H)} := \mathbb{E}(||L(t)||_H^2) < \infty$ for all $t \in \mathbb{T}$. Obviously, mean-square convergence can only be well-defined for processes with his property.

Theorem 2.2. *([24, Theorem 4.44]) Let L be a square-integrable Lévy process on H. Then there exists a $m \in H$ and a non-negative, symmetric trace class operator Q on H such that for all $h_1, h_2 \in H$ and $s,t \in (0,T]$*

- $\mathbb{E}((L(t),h_1)_H) = t(m,h_1)_H$,
- $\mathbb{E}((L(t)-mt,h_1)_H(L(s)-ms,h_2)_H) = \min(t,s)(Qh_1,h_2)_H$
- $\mathbb{E}(||L(t)-mt||_H^2) = t\,tr(Q)$,

where $tr(Q)$ denotes the trace of Q. The operator Q is also called covariance operator of L and m is called mean.

Note that Q in Theorem 2.2 is not necessarily equal to the operator Σ_H from the Lévy-Khintchine formula (2.1). They are only equal if the measure ν_H is zero, meaning the process L has no "jump component"[1]. The operator Q admits a spectral decomposition with a sequence $((\rho_i, e_i), i \in \mathbb{N})$ of orthonormal eigenpairs with non-negative eigenvalues. Thus, L has the spectral expansion

$$L(t) = \sum_{i \in \mathbb{N}} (L(t), e_i)_H e_i,$$

where the one-dimensional Lévy processes $(L(t), e_i)_H$ are not independent, but merely uncorrelated (see [24, Section 4.2.8]). For the approximation of L we employ one-dimensional Lévy processes $(\sqrt{\rho_i}\ell_i, i \in \mathbb{N})$, so that $\sqrt{\rho_i}\ell_i(t)$ is equal to $(L(t), e_i)_H$ in distribution for all $t \in \mathbb{T}$ and all $i \in \mathbb{N}$, and define, for $N \in \mathbb{N}$, the truncated sum

$$L_N(t) := \sum_{i=1}^{N} \sqrt{\rho_i} e_i \ell_i(t).$$

If the spectral basis $((\sqrt{\rho_i}e_i), i \in \mathbb{N})$ of H is given, the approximation of L by L_N reduces to the simulation of the one-dimensional processes ℓ_i. In general, the processes ℓ_i have *infinite activity*, i.e. $\mathbb{P}$-almost all paths of the process $(\ell_i(t), t \in \mathbb{T})$ have an infinite number of jumps in every compact time interval. Popular examples of Lévy processes with infinite activity are normal inverse Gaussian processes or hyperbolic processes, see [13]. As it is not possible to simulate infinitely many jumps, we need to find a suitable approximation $\widetilde{\ell}_i$ of ℓ_i and define

$$\widetilde{L}_N(t) := \sum_{i=1}^{N} \sqrt{\rho_i} e_i \widetilde{\ell}_i(t).$$

In the following, we derive a condition on the approximations $\widetilde{\ell}_i$ that ensures the convergence of $\widetilde{L}_N$ towards L in $L^2(\Omega;H)$ uniformly on $\mathbb{T}$. We consider the discretization of the process ℓ_i resp. $\widetilde{\ell}_i$ to be at fixed and equidistant points in $\mathbb{T}$, where we introduce a time step $\Delta t > 0$.

Theorem 2.3. *Let $L = (L(t), t \in \mathbb{T})$ be a square-integrable, H-valued Lévy process. The covariance operator Q of L is characterized by a sequence of (orthonormal) eigenpairs $((\rho_i, e_i), i \in \mathbb{N})$. Assume that there is a sequence of approximations $(\widetilde{\ell}_i, i \in \mathbb{N})$ of the one-dimensional processes $(\ell_i, i \in \mathbb{N})$ on an interval $\mathbb{T}$, such that the $L^2(\Omega;\mathbb{R})$-approximation error*

[1] This results in L being a drifted H-valued Gaussian process.

can be bounded by

$$\sup_{t\in\mathbb{T}} \mathbb{E}(|\ell_i(t) - \widetilde{\ell}_i(t)|^2) \leq C_\ell \Delta t, \tag{2.3}$$

where the constant $C_\ell > 0$ is independent of i and $\Delta t > 0$. If, for all $i \in \mathbb{N}$, the processes $\sqrt{\rho}_i \ell_i$ are in distribution equal to $(L(\cdot), e_i)_H$ then the sequence of approximations $(\widetilde{L}_N(t), N \in \mathbb{N})$ converges in mean-square-sense to $L(t)$, for each $t \in \mathbb{T}$, and the error is bounded by

$$\mathbb{E}(||L(t) - \widetilde{L}_N(t)||_H^2) \leq \Big(\big(T \sum_{i=N+1}^{\infty} \rho_i\big)^{1/2} + \big(C_\ell \Delta t \sum_{i=1}^{N} \rho_i\big)^{1/2} \Big)^2.$$

Proof. We can assume without loss of generality that the process L has zero mean. Using Minkowki's inequality, the upper error can be split into

$$\mathbb{E}(||L(t) - \widetilde{L}_N(t)||_H^2) \leq \Big(\mathbb{E}(||L(t) - L_N(t)||_H^2)^{1/2} + \mathbb{E}(||L_N(t) - \widetilde{L}_N(t)||_H^2)^{1/2} \Big)^2.$$

The square-integrability of L guarantees that Q is trace class and has positive eigenvalues, i.e.

$$tr(Q) = \sum_{i\in\mathbb{N}} \rho_i < +\infty.$$

$L(t)$ has covariance tQ, which yields for the first error term

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{E}(||L(t) - L_N(t)||_H^2) &= \mathbb{E}(||L(t)||_H^2) + \mathbb{E}(||L_N(t)||_H^2) - 2\mathbb{E}((L(t), L_N(t))_H) \\
&= t\, tr(Q) + \mathbb{E}\Big(\sum_{i,j=1}^{N} \big((L(t), e_i)_H e_i, (L(t), e_j)_H e_j\big)_H \Big) \\
&\quad - 2\mathbb{E}\big(\sum_{i=1}^{N} (L(t), (L(t), e_i)_H e_i)_H \big) \\
&= t \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \rho_i + \sum_{i=1}^{N} \mathbb{E}\big((L(t), e_i)_H^2\big) - 2 \sum_{i=1}^{N} \mathbb{E}\big((L(t), e_i)_H^2\big) \\
&= t \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \rho_i - \sum_{i=1}^{N} \mathbb{E}\big((L(t), e_i)_H^2\big).
\end{aligned}$$

With Theorem 2.2 we obtain

$$\mathbb{E}((L(t), e_i)_H^2) = t(Qe_i, e_i)_H = t\rho_i,$$

and hence

$$\mathbb{E}(||L(t) - L_N(t)||_H^2) = t \sum_{i=N+1}^{\infty} \rho_i \leq T \sum_{i=N+1}^{\infty} \rho_i.$$

As Q is a trace class operator, the sum on the right hand side becomes arbitrary small as $N \to \infty$. This implies that L_N converges in $L^2(\Omega; H)$ uniformly on $\mathbb{T}$ to L.

For the second error term, we derive with the assumption that $\sqrt{\rho}_i \ell_i \overset{\mathcal{L}}{=} (L(\cdot), e_i)_H$ and the convergence of $\widetilde{\ell}_i$, for all $i \in \mathbb{N}$,

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{E}(||L_N(t) - \widetilde{L}_N(t)||_H^2) &= \sum_{i,j=1}^{N} \mathbb{E}\big(\sqrt{\rho_i \rho_j}(\ell_i(t) - \widetilde{\ell}_i(t))(\ell_j(t) - \widetilde{\ell}_j(t))(e_i, e_j)_H\big) \\ &= \sum_{i=1}^{N} \rho_i ||e_i||_H^2 \mathbb{E}(|\ell_i(t) - \widetilde{\ell}_i(t)|^2) \leq C_\ell \Delta t \sum_{i=1}^{N} \rho_i,\end{aligned}$$

which proves the claim. Above and for the remainder of the paper we express equality in distribution by the relation $\overset{\mathcal{L}}{=}$. □

Remark 2.4. Theorem 2.3 states that the approximation $\widetilde{L}_N$ converges in $L^2(\Omega; H)$ to L uniformly on $\mathbb{T}$, for $N \to \infty$ and in the case that Equation (2.3) holds with a constant C_ℓ in the limit $\Delta t \to 0$. We may equilibrate both error contributions by choosing $N \in \mathbb{N}$ such that

$$T \sum_{i=N+1}^{\infty} \rho_i \approx C_\ell \Delta t \sum_{i=1}^{N} \rho_i. \tag{2.4}$$

The sum of the eigenvalues, $tr(Q)$, is often known a priori (for example if Q is a covariance operator of the Matérn class, see Section 5). Then, only the first N eigenvalues have to be determined until Eq. (2.4) is fulfilled. Further, optimal values for Δt and N may be chosen for given C_ℓ and $(\rho_i, i \in \mathbb{N})$.

For the approximation

$$\widetilde{L}_N(t) = \sum_{i=1}^{N} \sqrt{\rho_i} e_i \widetilde{\ell}_i(t)$$

of L, we required that the one-dimensional Lévy processes $(\widetilde{\ell}_i, i = 1, \ldots, N)$ are uncorrelated but not necessarily independent. Several questions may arise regarding this truncated sum:

1. How can we efficiently simulate suitable one-dimensional approximations $\widetilde{\ell}_i$ of ℓ_i and determine the constant C_ℓ to apply Theorem 2.3?
2. Is L_N again a Lévy field for arbitrary one-dimensional processes $(\ell_i, i \in \mathbb{N})$ and can the law of $L_N(t)$ for a given spectral basis $((\sqrt{\rho}_i e_i), i \in \mathbb{N})$ and fixed $N \in \mathbb{N}$ be determined?
3. Is it possible to construct L_N in a way such that its marginal processes follow a desired distribution?

In the next chapter we address the first question and present a novel approach for the approximation of arbitrary one-dimensional Lévy processes ℓ_i. We derive explicit error bounds and convergence results in $L^p(\Omega; \mathbb{R})$, hence we are able to determine C_ℓ or at least bound this constant from above. The last two questions on the distribution properties of L_N are then investigated in Section 4 for an important subclass of Lévy fields. We discuss distributional features of L_N so as to use the approximation methodology developed in Section 3 efficiently to draw samples of the field L_N.

3. Simulation of Lévy processes by Fourier inversion

The simulation of an arbitrary one-dimensional Lévy process $\ell = (\ell(t), t \in \mathbb{T})$ is not straightforward, because sufficiently many discrete realizations of ℓ in $\mathbb{T}$ are needed and the distribution of the increment $\ell(t + \Delta t) - \ell(t)$ for some small time step $\Delta t > 0$ is not explicitly

known in general. However, the characteristic function of ℓ is given explicitly for a broad class of Lévy processes. We exploit this knowledge by so-called *Fourier inversion* to draw samples of the process' increments over an arbitrary large time step $\Delta t > 0$. Next, we motivate our simulation technique before we show the convergence of the generated random variables towards the target Lévy process in $L^p(\Omega; R)$ and almost surely. In Section 5, we apply the described method to simulate GH Lévy fields. A well-known and common way to simulate a Lévy process with characteristic triplet (ι, σ^2, ν) (see Equation (2.2)) is the *compound Poisson approximation* (CPA) suggested in [27] and [29]. All jumps of the process larger than some $\varepsilon > 0$ are approximated by a sum of independent compound Poisson processes and the small jumps by their expected values resp. by a Brownian motion. For details and convergence theorems of this method we refer to [1, 27, 29]. Although the CPA is applicable in a very general setting, in the sense that only the triplet (ι, σ^2, ν) has to be known for simulation, it has several drawbacks. It is possible to show that the CPA converges under certain assumptions in distribution to a Lévy process with characteristic triplet (ι, σ^2, ν), but in general no error bounds with respect to ε or the discretization of the measure ν are available. Furthermore, if the cumulated density function (CDF) of ν is unknown, numerical integration with respect to the measure ν is necessary. Evaluating the density of ν at sufficiently many points to obtain a good approximation might be time consuming, especially if this involves computationally expensive components (e.g. Bessel functions). It is, further, a-priori not clear how to discretize the measure ν (we refer to a discussion on this matter in [29, Chapter 8]). One could choose for example equidistant or equally weighted points, but this choice might have a significant impact on the precision and the speed of the simulation, and is impossible to be assessed beforehand. The disadvantages of the CPA method motivate the development of an alternative methodology.

3.1. **Inversion of the Characteristic Function.** Let ℓ be an one-dimensional Lévy process. We consider the case where we not only know the characteristic triplet (ι, σ^2, ν) of this process, but also have an explicit form of its characteristic function ϕ_ℓ. For $t \in \mathbb{R}_+$ and a time step $\Delta t > 0$, the characteristic function of the increment $\ell(\Delta t + t) - \ell(t)$ can then be written as

$$\mathbb{E}[\exp(iu(\ell(t + \Delta t) - l(t)))] = \mathbb{E}[\exp(iu(\ell(\Delta t)))] = \phi_\ell(u)^{\Delta t}.$$

If F denotes the CDF of the increment of ℓ expressed via the characteristic function $\phi_\ell^{\Delta t}$, we obtain by Fourier inversion (see [16])

$$F(x) = \frac{1}{2} - \int_{\mathbb{R}} \frac{\phi_\ell(u)^{\Delta t}}{2\pi i u} \exp(-iux) du. \tag{3.1}$$

This motivates the following approach for the approximation of ℓ within the time interval $\mathbb{T}$:

Algorithm 3.1.

(i) Choose $n \in \mathbb{N}$, define $\Delta t := T/n$ and set $t_j = j\Delta t$ for $j = 0, \dots, n$.
(ii) Generate i.i.d. random variables $U_1, \dots, U_n$, where $U_j \sim \mathcal{U}([0, 1])$ and determine $x_j := \inf\{x \in \mathbb{R} | F(x) = U_j\}$ for $j = 1, \dots, n$.
(iii) Set $\ell_F(t) = 0$ if $t \in [0, t_1)$, $\ell_F(t) = \sum_{k=1}^{j} x_k$ if $t \in [t_j, t_{j+1})$ for $j = 1, \dots, n-1$ and $\ell_F(T) = \sum_{j=1}^{n} x_j$.

This yields an approximation of ℓ given by the piecewise constant process ℓ_F. The evaluation of F is crucial and may, in general, only be done numerically. To approximate the integral in Eq. (3.1), we employ the discrete Fourier inversion method introduced in [17]. With this

method the approximation error can be controlled with relatively weak assumptions on the characteristic function. Hence, the algorithm is applicable for a broad class of Lévy processes.

Assumption 3.2. The distribution with characteristic function $\phi_\ell^{\Delta t}$ is continuous with finite variance and CDF F. Furthermore,

- There exists a constant $R > 0$ and $\eta > 1$ such that $F(-x) \leq R|x|^{-\eta}$ and $1 - F(x) \leq R|x|^{-\eta}$ for all $x > 0$.
- There exists a constant $B > 0$ and $\theta > 0$ such that $|\phi_\ell(u)^{\Delta t}| \leq B|\frac{u}{2\pi}|^{-\theta}$ for all $u \in \mathbb{R}$.

In case of infinite variance, we consider bounds on the density function instead:

Assumption 3.3. The distribution with characteristic function $\phi_\ell^{\Delta t}$ is continuous with density f. Furthermore,

- There exists a constant $R > 0$ and $\eta > 1$ such that $|f(x)| \leq R|x|^{-\eta}$ for all $x \in \mathbb{R}$.
- There exists a constant $B > 0$ and $\theta > 0$ such that $|\phi_\ell(u)^{\Delta t}| \leq B|\frac{u}{2\pi}|^{-\theta}$ for all $u \in \mathbb{R}$.

Remark 3.4. Usually, F or f are unknown, but only the characteristic function $\phi_\ell^{\Delta t}$ is given. To obtain R and η, one can choose $R = (-1)^k \frac{d^{2k}}{du^{2k}}(\phi_\ell(u)^{\Delta t})\big|_{u=0}$ and $\eta = 2k$ in Ass. 3.2, resp. $R = \frac{1}{2\pi}\int_{\mathbb{R}} |\frac{d^k}{du^k}(\phi_\ell(u)^{\Delta t})|du$ and $\eta = k$ in Ass. 3.3, where k is any non-negative integer such that the derivatives exist (see [17, Lemma 12 and 13]). For example, in the first set of assumptions, the finite variance ensures that we can use $\eta = 2$ and R equal to the second moment of the distribution with characteristic function $\phi_\ell^{\Delta t}$.

As an approximation of F as in Eq. (3.1) we introduce the function $\widetilde{F}$ given by

$$\widetilde{F}(x) := \sum_{k=-M/2}^{M/2} f_k \exp(-i2\pi kx/J),$$

for $x \in \mathbb{R}$, where

$$f_k := \begin{cases} 1/2 & \text{for } k = 0 \\ \frac{1-\cos(2\pi\kappa k)}{i2\pi k}\phi_\ell(-2\pi k/J)^{\Delta t} & \text{for } 0 < |k| < M/2 \\ 0 & \text{for } k = M/2 \end{cases},$$

M is an even integer and $\kappa, J > 0$ are parameters which are determined below. Note that $f_k = \overline{f_{-k}}$, where $\overline{z}$ denotes the complex conjugate for $z \in \mathbb{C}$. The Hermitean symmetry also holds for the function $k \mapsto \exp(-i2\pi kx/J)$. This ensures that, for every $x \in \mathbb{R}$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \widetilde{F}(x) &= \frac{1}{2} + \sum_{k=1}^{M/2-1} f_k \exp(-i2\pi kx/J) + \overline{f_k \exp(-i2\pi kx/J)} \\ &= \frac{1}{2} + 2\,\mathrm{Re}\Big(\sum_{k=1}^{M/2-1} f_k \exp(-i2\pi kx/J)\Big) \end{aligned}$$

and hence $\widetilde{F}(x) \in \mathbb{R}$ for any real-valued argument x. The last identity should be exploited during the simulation to save computational time as here only half the summation is required. Lastly, we denote by $\zeta(z, s) := \sum_{k=0}^{\infty}(k + s)^{-z}$ for $s, z \in \mathbb{C}$ with $\mathrm{Re}(s) > 0$ and $\mathrm{Re}(z) > 1$ the

Hurwitz zeta function and define as in [17]

$$V_1(\kappa,\eta) := (\kappa/2)^{-\eta} + 2\zeta(\eta, 1-\frac{\kappa}{2}) + \zeta(\eta, 1+\frac{\kappa}{2}) + \zeta(\eta, 1-\frac{3\kappa}{2}),$$
$$V_2(\kappa,\eta) := \frac{2^{\eta-1}\kappa^{1-\eta}}{\eta-1} + \frac{\kappa}{2}\Big(2\zeta(\eta, 1-\frac{\kappa}{2}) + \zeta(\eta, 1+\frac{\kappa}{2}) + \zeta(\eta, 1-\frac{3\kappa}{2})\Big).$$

The expressions $V_1(\kappa,\eta)$ and $V_2(\kappa,\eta)$ establish conditions on the choice of the (not yet determined) parameter κ in Theorem 3.5. For a given domain parameter $D > 0$ and accuracy $\varepsilon > 0$ the approximation $\widetilde{F}$ should fulfill the error bound

$$|\widetilde{F}(x) - F(x)| < \varepsilon \quad \text{for } x \in [-D/2, D/2].$$

Once κ is determined, this can be achieved by choosing a sufficiently large parameter J and, based on this J, a sufficiently large number of summands M. Admissible values for κ, J and M depend on D, ε and the constants in Assumption 3.2 resp. 3.3.

Theorem 3.5. *(*[17, Theorem 10 and 11]*) Let $D > 0$ and $\varepsilon > 0$. If Assumption 3.2 holds, choose κ, J and M such that*

$$0 < \kappa < \frac{2}{3} \quad \text{and} \quad \kappa^\eta V_1(\kappa,\eta) \le 2^{\eta+1},$$
$$J \ge \frac{D}{\kappa} \quad \text{and} \quad J \ge \Big(\frac{3RV_1(\kappa,\eta)}{2\varepsilon}\Big)^{1/\eta},$$

and

$$M \ge 2 + 2J\Big(\frac{6B}{\varepsilon\pi\theta}\Big)^{1/\theta}.$$

If Assumption 3.3 holds, choose κ, J and M such that

$$0 < \kappa < \frac{2}{3} \quad \text{and} \quad \kappa^{\eta-1} V_2(\kappa,\eta) \le \frac{2^\eta}{\eta-1},$$
$$J \ge \frac{D}{\kappa} \quad \text{and} \quad J \ge \Big(\frac{3RV_2(\kappa,\eta)}{2\varepsilon}\Big)^{1/(\eta-1)},$$

and

$$M \ge 2 + 2J\Big(\frac{6B}{\varepsilon\pi\theta}\Big)^{1/\theta}.$$

This yields, for either case, that $|F(x) - \widetilde{F}(x)| < \varepsilon$ for all $x \in [-D/2, D/2]$ and it is always possible to find a κ that meets the given conditions.

Remark 3.6. In [17], by

$$J \ge \frac{2}{\kappa}\left(\frac{3R}{\varepsilon}\right)^{1/\eta} \text{ resp. } \quad J \ge \frac{2}{\kappa}\left(\frac{3R}{\varepsilon(\eta-1)}\right)^{1/(\eta-1)}$$

in fact stricter conditions are imposed on J. The proofs of Theorems 10 and 11 in [17] still give immediately a proof for Theorem 3.5. The advantage of the bounds in Theorem 3.5 is that they produce a smaller approximation error in the following analysis (see also Remark 3.12). We refer to [17] for an optimal choice of κ depending on η. Once κ is determined, it is favorable to choose D and ε in a way such that none of the parameters has a dominant effect on the resulting number of summations M. This is ensured if the two lower bounds on J are equal, meaning for fixed $D > 0$ we set

$$\varepsilon = \frac{3}{2} RV_1(\kappa,\eta)\kappa^\eta D^{-\eta}$$

in the first scenario and

$$\varepsilon = \frac{3}{2} RV_2(\kappa, \eta)\kappa^{\eta-1} D^{-\eta+1}$$

if the second set of assumptions holds.

Since the approximation error $|\widetilde{F}(x) - F(x)|$ is only bounded for $x \in [-D/2, D/2]$, we have to modify the second step in Algorithm 3.1:

Algorithm 3.7.

(i) Choose $n \in \mathbb{N}$, define $\Delta t := T/n$ and set $t_j = j\Delta t$ for $j = 0, \dots, n$.

(ii) Generate i.i.d. random variables $(U_j \sim \mathcal{U}([0,1]), j = 1, \dots, n)$ and set, for $j = 1, \dots, n$,

$$\widetilde{x}_j = \begin{cases} -D/2 & \text{if } U_j < \min\{\widetilde{F}([-D/2, D/2])\} \\ D/2 & \text{if } U_j > \max\{\widetilde{F}([-D/2, D/2])\} \\ \inf\{x \in \mathbb{R} | \widetilde{F}(x) = U_j\} & \text{if } U_j \in \widetilde{F}[-D/2, D/2] \end{cases}.$$

(iii) Set $\widetilde{\ell}_F(t) = 0$ if $t \in [0, t_1)$, $\widetilde{\ell}_F(t) = \sum_{k=1}^{j} \widetilde{x}_k$ if $t \in [t_j, t_{j+1})$ for $j = 1, \dots, n-1$ and $\widetilde{\ell}_F(T) = \sum_{j=1}^{n} \widetilde{x}_j$.

Intuitively, if we choose D large and ε small enough, the atoms in the distribution of $\widetilde{x}_i$ at $\pm D/2$ disappear. The function $\widetilde{F}$ is then sufficiently close to the CDF F, hence the generated random variables $\widetilde{x}_i$ will have a distribution similar to F. From here on, we define X as the random variable which is generated from $U \sim \mathcal{U}([0,1])$ by inversion of the (exact) CDF F and $\widetilde{X}$ as the random variable generated from U by inversion of the approximated CDF $\widetilde{F}$.

Theorem 3.8. *Let $\widetilde{F}$ be the approximation of F which is valid for parameters $D > 0$ and $\varepsilon > 0$ in the sense of Theorem 3.5. Then $\widetilde{X}$ converges in distribution to a random variable X with CDF equal to F as $D \to \infty$ and $\varepsilon \to 0$.*

Proof. First, note that $\widetilde{F}$ is not necessarily monotone and might admit arbitrary values outside of $[-D/2, D/2]$, thus cannot be regarded as a CDF. Since $\widetilde{X}$ only admits values in the desired interval, we obtain probability zero for the event that $|\widetilde{X}| > D/2$. With this in mind we construct the CDF of $\widetilde{X}$ and show its convergence in distribution using Portmanteau's theorem. We define the function

$$\widehat{F} : \mathbb{R} \to [0,1], \quad x \mapsto \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } x < -D/2 \\ \min(1, m_D(x)) \mathbf{1}_{m_D(x)>0} & \text{if } x \in [-D/2, D/2] \\ 1 & \text{if } x > D/2 \end{cases},$$

where $m_D(x) := \max_{y \in [-D/2, x]} \widetilde{F}(y)$. The continuity of $\widetilde{F}$ guarantees that $m_D(x)$ is well-defined for each $x \in [-D/2, D/2]$. Clearly, $\widehat{F}$ is monotone increasing and

$$\mathbb{P}(\widetilde{X} \le x) = \widehat{F}(x)$$

if $|x| > D/2$. For $|x| \le D/2$ we have that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}(\widetilde{X} \le x) &= \mathbb{P}(\inf\{|y| \le D/2 \,|\, \widetilde{F}(y) \ge U\} \le x) \\ &= \mathbb{P}(\max_{y \in [-D/2, x]} \widetilde{F}(y) \ge U) \\ &= \min(1, m_D(x)) \mathbf{1}_{\{m_D(x)>0\}} = \widehat{F}(x), \end{aligned}$$

hence $\widehat{F}$ is the CDF of $\widetilde{X}$. With the monotonicity of F and $|F-\widetilde{F}|<\varepsilon$ on $[-D/2,D/2]$ we get

$$\begin{aligned}\widehat{F}(x) &= \min(1, m_D(x))\mathbf{1}_{\{m_D(x)>0\}} \leq \min(1, \max_{y\in[-D/2,x]} \widetilde{F}(y)) \\ &\leq \min(1, \max_{y\in[-D/2,x]} F(y)+\varepsilon) = \min(1, F(x)+\varepsilon),\end{aligned}$$

for $x\in[-D/2,D/2]$ and analogously

$$\widehat{F}(x) \geq \min(1, \max_{y\in[-D/2,x]} F(y)-\varepsilon)\mathbf{1}_{\{\max_{y\in[-D/2,x]} F(y)-\varepsilon>0\}} = \max(F(x)-\varepsilon, 0),$$

thus

$$|\widehat{F}(x)-F(x)| \leq \varepsilon.$$

We choose sequences $(D_m, m\in\mathbb{N})$ and $(\varepsilon_n, n\in\mathbb{N})$ with $\lim_{m\to\infty} D_m=\infty$, $\lim_{n\to\infty}\varepsilon_n=0$ and denote by $\widehat{F}_{m,n}$ the CDF of the random variables $\widetilde{X}_{m,n}$ corresponding to each D_m and ε_n. For every $x\in\mathbb{R}$ there is some m^* such that $x\in[-D_m/2, D_m/2]$ for all $m\geq m^*$, hence

$$\lim_{n\to\infty}\lim_{m\to\infty}|\widehat{F}_{m,n}(x)-F(x)| \leq \lim_{n\to\infty}\varepsilon_n = 0$$

and the claim follows by Portmanteau's theorem. □

Under additional, but natural, assumptions, it is possible to show stronger convergence results of the approximation for both sets of assumptions.

Theorem 3.9. *($L^p(\Omega;\mathbb{R})$-convergence I) Let F be continuously differentiable on $\mathbb{R}$ with density f and $\phi_\ell^{\Delta t}$ be bounded as in Assumption 3.2 with $\eta>1$. Furthermore, assume that the approximation parameters D and ε fulfill $D=C\varepsilon^{-d}$ for $C,d>0$. For $\widetilde{X}$ and X it holds, for all $p\in[1,\eta)$, that*

$$\mathbb{E}(|\widetilde{X}-X|^p)\to 0 \quad \text{as } \varepsilon\to 0$$

if $d<\frac{1}{p}$.

Proof. Let $\varepsilon>0$, $D=C\varepsilon^{-d}$ and $p\in[1,\eta)$ as in the claim. We split the expectation in the following way

$$\mathbb{E}(|\widetilde{X}-X|^p) = \mathbb{E}(|\widetilde{X}-X|^p\mathbf{1}_{\{|X|>D/2\}}) + \mathbb{E}(|\widetilde{X}-X|^p\mathbf{1}_{\{|X|\leq D/2\}}),$$

and show the convergence for each term on the right hand side. Recall that $\widetilde{X}\in[-D/2,D/2]$ by construction. We obtain for the first term

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{E}(|\widetilde{X}-X|^p\mathbf{1}_{\{|X|>D/2\}}) &\leq \int_{D/2}^{\infty}|-D/2-x|^p f(x)dx + \int_{-\infty}^{-D/2}|D/2-x|^p f(x)dx \\ &= \int_{D/2}^{\infty}(D/2+x)^p(f(x)+f(-x))dx \\ &\overset{*}{=} \int_0^{\infty} p(y+D)^{p-1}\int_y^{\infty} d(F(x+D/2)-F(-x-D/2))dy \\ &\overset{**}{\leq} 2pR\int_0^{\infty}\frac{(y+D)^{p-1}}{(y+D/2)^{\eta}}dy = 2^p pR\int_0^{\infty}\frac{(y/2+D/2)^{p-1}}{(y+D/2)^{\eta}}dy \\ &< 2^p pR\int_0^{\infty}\frac{1}{(y+D/2)^{\eta+1-p}}dy \leq 2^p pR\zeta(\eta+1-p, D/2),\end{aligned}$$

where we have used Fubini's theorem in * and Assumption 3.2 in **. The Hurwitz zeta function ζ in the upper estimation is well-defined (as $\eta > p$) and converges to 0 as $D \to \infty$.

For the second term, consider two realizations of the random variables $X(\omega)$ and $\widetilde{X}(\omega)$ for some $\omega \in \Omega$, where $|X(\omega)| \leq D/2$. F is continuously differentiable by assumption, hence

$$F(X(\omega)) - F(\widetilde{X}(\omega)) = f(\xi(\omega))(X(\omega) - \widetilde{X}(\omega)),$$

with $\xi(\omega)$ lying in between $X(\omega)$ and $\widetilde{X}(\omega)$, meaning $|\xi(\omega)| \leq D/2$ and

$$\mathbf{1}_{\{|X(\omega)| \leq D/2\}}(\omega) \leq \mathbf{1}_{\{|\xi(\omega)| \leq D/2\}}(\omega).$$

For $\widetilde{\varepsilon} := C^{-1}\varepsilon^{d+1} > 0$ we split the remaining expectation once more into

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{E}(|\widetilde{X} - X|^p \mathbf{1}_{\{|X| \leq D/2\}}) \leq & \underbrace{\mathbb{E}(|\widetilde{X} - X|^p \mathbf{1}_{\{|\xi| \leq D/2, f(\xi) \geq \widetilde{\varepsilon}\}})}_{:=I} \\ & + \underbrace{\mathbb{E}(|\widetilde{X} - X|^p \mathbf{1}_{\{|\xi| \leq D/2, f(\xi) < \widetilde{\varepsilon}\}})}_{:=II}.\end{aligned}$$

In the case that $f(\xi(\omega)) \geq \widetilde{\varepsilon}$, we can rearrange the terms to

$$|\widetilde{X}(\omega) - X(\omega)|^p = \frac{|F(\widetilde{X}(\omega)) - F(X(\omega))|^p}{f(\xi(\omega))^p}.$$

If X and $\widetilde{X}$ are generated by $U \sim \mathcal{U}[0,1]$ and $\widehat{F}$ denotes again the CDF of $\widetilde{X}$, this yields

$$|\widetilde{X}(\omega) - X(\omega)|^p = \frac{|F(\widetilde{X}(\omega)) - \widehat{F}(\widetilde{X}(\omega))|^p}{f(\xi(\omega))^p} < \frac{\varepsilon^p}{\widetilde{\varepsilon}^p},$$

where we have used that $U(\omega) = F(X(\omega)) = \widehat{F}(\widetilde{X}(\omega))$ and $|F(\widetilde{X}(\omega)) - \widehat{F}(\widetilde{X}(\omega))| < \varepsilon$ (see Theorem 3.8) in the second step. This gives an upper bound for I:

(3.2)

$$I < \varepsilon^p \mathbb{E}(f(\xi)^{-p} \mathbf{1}_{\{|\xi| \leq D/2, f(\xi) \geq \widetilde{\varepsilon}\}}) = \varepsilon^p \int_{-D/2}^{D/2} \mathbf{1}_{\{f(\xi) \geq \widetilde{\varepsilon}\}} f(\xi)^{1-p} d\xi \leq \frac{\varepsilon^p}{\widetilde{\varepsilon}^{p-1}} \int_{-D/2}^{D/2} \mathbf{1}_{\{f(\xi) \geq \widetilde{\varepsilon}\}} d\xi.$$

If $f(\xi(\omega)) < \widetilde{\varepsilon}$, we obtain by $|\widetilde{X}(\omega) - X(\omega)| \mathbf{1}_{\{|X(\omega)| \leq D/2\}} \leq D$

$$II \leq D^p \mathbb{E}(\mathbf{1}_{\{|\xi| \leq D/2, f(\xi) < \widetilde{\varepsilon}\}}) = D^p \int_{-D/2}^{D/2} \mathbf{1}_{\{f(\xi) < \widetilde{\varepsilon}\}} f(\xi) d\xi < D^p \widetilde{\varepsilon} \int_{-D/2}^{D/2} \mathbf{1}_{\{f(\xi) < \widetilde{\varepsilon}\}} d\xi \tag{3.3}$$

and hence by Eqs. (3.2) and (3.3) and $\widetilde{\varepsilon} = C^{-1}\varepsilon^{1+d}$

$$\mathbb{E}(|\widetilde{X} - X|^p \mathbf{1}_{\{|X| \leq D/2\}}) \leq I + II < D^p \widetilde{\varepsilon} \Big(\int_{-D/2}^{D/2} \mathbf{1}_{\{f(\xi) \geq \widetilde{\varepsilon}\}} d\xi + \int_{-D/2}^{D/2} \mathbf{1}_{\{f(\xi) < \widetilde{\varepsilon}\}} d\xi \Big) = D^{p+1} \widetilde{\varepsilon}.$$

With the estimate for $\mathbb{E}(|\widetilde{X} - X|^p \mathbf{1}_{\{|X| > D/2\}})$ and $D = C\varepsilon^{-d}$ this leads to

$$\mathbb{E}(|\widetilde{X} - X|^p) < 2^p p R \zeta(\eta + 1 - p, C\varepsilon^{-d}/2) + C^p \varepsilon^{1-dp} = 2^p p R \zeta(\eta + 1 - p, C\varepsilon^{-d}/2) + C^\eta D^{p-\eta},$$

and since $0 < d < \frac{1}{p}$ and $\eta > p$ by assumption,

$$\mathbb{E}(|\widetilde{X} - X|^p) \to 0 \quad \text{as } \varepsilon \to 0.$$

□

Remark 3.10. The relation $\widetilde{\varepsilon} = C^{-1}\varepsilon^{d+1}$ is chosen such that the factors preceding the integrals in Eqs. (3.2) and (3.3) are equilibrated. As only the sum of the two integrals is known a-priori, this leads to a better error estimation compared to non-equilibrated factors.

Theorem 3.11. *($L^p(\Omega;\mathbb{R})$-convergence II) Let F be continuously differentiable on $\mathbb{R}$ with density f and $\phi_\ell^{\Delta t}$ be bounded as in Assumption 3.3 with $\eta > 2$. Furthermore, assume that the approximation parameters D and ε fulfill $D = C\varepsilon^{-d}$ for $C, d > 0$. For $\widetilde{X}$ and X it holds, for all $p \in [1, \eta - 1)$, that*

$$\mathbb{E}(|\widetilde{X} - X|^p) \to 0 \quad \text{as } \varepsilon \to 0$$

if $d < \frac{1}{p}$.

Proof. Let $\varepsilon > 0$, $D = C\varepsilon^{-d}$ and $p \in [1, \eta - 1)$. Again, we split the expectation into

$$\mathbb{E}(|\widetilde{X} - X|^p) = \mathbb{E}(|\widetilde{X} - X|^p \mathbf{1}_{\{|X|>D/2\}}) + \mathbb{E}(|\widetilde{X} - X|^p \mathbf{1}_{\{|X|\le D/2\}}),$$

and show the convergence for the first term only, as the second term can be treated analogously to Theorem 3.9. In the same way as in Theorem 3.9, we may write for the first term

$$\mathbb{E}(|\widetilde{X} - X|^p \mathbf{1}_{\{|X|>D/2\}}) \le \int_{D/2}^{\infty} (D/2) + x)^p (f(x) + f(-x)) dx,$$

and further, by Assumption 3.3, follows

$$\begin{aligned}\int_{D/2}^{\infty} ((D/2)^p + x^p)(f(x) + f(-x))dx &\le 2R \int_{D/2}^{\infty} ((D/2) + x)^p x^{-\eta} dx \\ &= 2^{p+1} R \int_0^{\infty} \frac{(D/2 + x/2)^p}{(D/2 + x)^\eta} dx \\ &< 2^{p+1} R \zeta(\eta - p, C\varepsilon^{-d}/2),\end{aligned}$$

which tends to zero as $\varepsilon \to 0$, because $\eta > p + 1$.

□

Remark 3.12. As expected, the admissible range of values for d and η narrows as the rate of convergence p increases. For example, to obtain $L^2(\Omega;\mathbb{R})$-convergence, we need $d < \frac{1}{2}$ and $\eta > 2$ in Theorem 3.9 and $\eta > 3$ in Theorem 3.11. Recall Remark 3.6, where we have concluded that optimal relations between D and ε are given by

$$\begin{aligned} D &= \kappa \left(3/2\, R V_1(\kappa, \eta)\right)^{1/\eta} \varepsilon^{-1/\eta} \quad \text{if Assumption 3.2 holds and} \\ D &= \kappa \left(3/2\, R V_2(\kappa, \eta)\right)^{1/(\eta-1)} \varepsilon^{-1/(\eta-1)} \quad \text{if Assumption 3.3 holds.}\end{aligned}$$

For $L^p(\Omega;\mathbb{R})$-convergence, we need in both cases $D = C\varepsilon^{-d}$, where $C > 0$ and $d \in (0, 1/p)$. Hence, we can simply use $C = \kappa(3/2\, R V_1(\kappa, \eta))^{1/\eta}$ and $d = 1/\eta < 1/p$ in the first scenario and $C = \kappa(3/2\, R V_2(\kappa, \eta))^{1/\eta}$ and $d = 1/(\eta - 1) < 1/p$ for the second set of assumptions. This explains the bounds on J (see also Remark 3.6): In Theorem 3.9, we obtain the expression $C^\eta D^{p-\eta}$ as a term of the overall error. If we had used the restrictions on J as in [17], we would have used $C = 2(3R)^{1/\eta}$ instead of the choice above and this would have resulted in an error term $C^\eta D^{p-\eta}$ being nearly twice as large (the argumentation works analogously for Theorem 3.11).

Example 3.13. The conditions $\eta > p$ in Theorem 3.9 and $\eta > p-1$ in Theorem 3.11 cannot be relaxed as the following examples show: First, we investigate the Student's t-distribution with 3 degrees of freedom and density function

$$f_{t3}(x) = \frac{\Gamma_G(2)}{\sqrt{3\pi}\Gamma_G(3/2)} \left(1 + \frac{x^2}{3}\right)^{-2},$$

where $x \in \mathbb{R}$ and $\Gamma_G(\cdot)$ is the Gamma function. As shown in [19], this distribution is infinitely divisible and has characteristic function

$$\phi_{t3}(u) := \exp(-\sqrt{3}|u|)(\sqrt{3}|u| + 1),$$

hence we can define a Lévy process $(\ell_{t3}(t), t \in \mathbb{T})$ with $\phi_{t3}(u)^t$ as characteristic function. For simplicity we set $\Delta t = 1$. In this case the (symmetric) distribution of the increment $\ell_{t3}(t+\Delta t) - \ell_{t3}(t)$ has zero mean, finite variance, and its CDF F can be bounded for $x > 0$ by

$$F(-x) = 1 - F(x) = \int_{-\infty}^{-x} f_{t3}(y)dy < \frac{\Gamma_G(2)}{\sqrt{3\pi}\Gamma_G(3/2)} \int_{-\infty}^{-x} \frac{3^2}{y^4} dy = \frac{\sqrt{3}\Gamma_G(2)}{\sqrt{\pi}\Gamma_G(3/2)} x^{-3} =: Rx^{-3}.$$

Thus, this yields $\eta = 3$. The bounds for ϕ_{t3} are also straightforward:

$$|\phi_{t3}(u)| \leq (2\pi)^{-1} \max_{\widehat{u}>0} \exp(-\sqrt{3}\widehat{u})(\sqrt{3}\widehat{u}^2 + \widehat{u})|\frac{u}{2\pi}|^{-1} =: B|\frac{u}{2\pi}|^{-1},$$

where the maximum in B is found by differentiation giving $\widehat{u} = (1+\sqrt{5})/(2\sqrt{3})$. Now, all requirements for L^3-convergence except $\eta > 3$ are fulfilled. But the t-distribution with 3 degrees of freedom does not admit a third moment, hence we cannot have $L^3(\Omega;\mathbb{R})$-convergence although $\eta = 3$.

For the second case we consider the (standard) Cauchy process with characteristic function $\phi_C(u)^t = \exp(-t|u|)$. It can be shown that the increment over time $\Delta t > 0$ is again Cauchy-distributed with density

$$f_C(x) = \frac{\Delta t}{\pi(\Delta t^2 + x^2)}.$$

This means the CDF of the increment is continuously differentiable and the bounds as in Assumption 3.3 are easily found by $f_C(x) \leq (\Delta t/\pi)|x|^{-2}$ for $x \in \mathbb{R}$ and

$$|\phi_C(u)^{\Delta t}| \leq (2\pi)^{-1} \max_{u\in\mathbb{R}} u \exp(-\Delta t|u|)|\frac{u}{2\pi}|^{-1} = (2\pi\Delta t)^{-1} \exp(-1)|\frac{u}{2\pi}|^{-1}$$

for $u \in \mathbb{R}$. But clearly, $L^p(\Omega;\mathbb{R})$-convergence in the sense of Theorem 3.11 for any $p \geq 1$ is impossible, as the Cauchy process does not have any finite moments.

From L^p-convergence follows almost sure convergence by a Borel–Cantelli-type argument, given η in Assumptions 3.2 and 3.3 is large enough.

Corollary 3.14. *Under the assumptions of Theorem 3.9, set $\psi_1 := \min(d\eta, 1-d)$, let $m \in \mathbb{N}$ and set $\varepsilon = \varepsilon(m) = m^{-q}$, with $q > \psi_1^{-1}$. If $(\widetilde{X}_m, m \in \mathbb{N})$ is generated based on the sequence $(\varepsilon(m), m \in \mathbb{N})$ (and the corresponding $D(m) = C\varepsilon(m)^{-d}$), then $(\widetilde{X}_m, m \in \mathbb{N})$ converges to X $\mathbb{P}$-almost surely.*

Proof. If the assumptions of Theorem 3.9 with $\eta > 1$ hold, we can ensure at least $L^1(\Omega;\mathbb{R})$ convergence. Note that the Hurwitz zeta function $\zeta(\eta + 1 - p, D/2) = \zeta(\eta + 1 - p, C/2\varepsilon^{-d})$ is

of order $\mathcal{O}(\varepsilon^{d(\eta+1-p)})$ as $\varepsilon \to 0$. With Markov's inequality, $p = 1$ and the given error bounds, we get that for each $\widehat{\varepsilon} > 0$ and $m \in \mathbb{N}$

$$\mathbb{P}(|\widetilde{X}_m - X| > \widehat{\varepsilon}) \leq \frac{\mathbb{E}(|\widetilde{X}_m - X|)}{\widehat{\varepsilon}} \leq \frac{\widetilde{C}}{\widehat{\varepsilon}} \left(\varepsilon(m)^{d\eta} + \varepsilon(m)^{1-d}\right) \leq \frac{2\widetilde{C}}{\widehat{\varepsilon}} \varepsilon(m)^{\psi_1},$$

(recall that $1 > \psi_1 > 0$ and $\varepsilon(m) \leq 1$) where the constant $\widetilde{C} > 0$ depends on R, η and C. But this means

$$\sum_{m=1}^{\infty} \mathbb{P}(|\widetilde{X}_m - X| > \widehat{\varepsilon}) \leq \frac{2\widetilde{C}}{\widehat{\varepsilon}} \sum_{m=1}^{\infty} \varepsilon(m)^{\psi_1} = \frac{2\widetilde{C}}{\widehat{\varepsilon}} \sum_{m=1}^{\infty} m^{-q\psi_1} < \infty,$$

since $q\psi_1 > 1$ by construction. The claim then follows by the Borel-Cantelli lemma. □

Corollary 3.15. *Under the assumptions of Theorem 3.11, set* $\psi_2 := \min(d(\eta-1), 1-d)$, *let* $m \in \mathbb{N}$ *and set* $\varepsilon = \varepsilon(m) = m^{-q}$, *with* $q > \psi_2^{-1}$. *If* $(\widetilde{X}_m, m \in \mathbb{N})$ *is generated based on the sequence* $(\varepsilon(m), m \in \mathbb{N})$ *(and the corresponding* $D(m) = C\varepsilon(m)^{-d}$*), then* $(\widetilde{X}_m, m \in \mathbb{N})$ *converges to* X $\mathbb{P}$*-almost surely.*

So far we have always considered Δt as a fixed positive constant. In the next statement we investigate the case $\Delta t \to 0$ and assume that the bounds in Theorems 3.9 or 3.11 hold for any $\Delta t > 0$ that is smaller or equal to some $\widetilde{\Delta} > 0$, this leads to a bound for the constant C_ℓ in Theorem 2.3.

Corollary 3.16. *Let* ℓ *be a Lévy process with characteristic function* ϕ_ℓ. *For any* $\Delta t > 0$, *let* $F_{\Delta t}$ *denote the CDF and* $f_{\Delta t}$ *the density function of an increment of* ℓ *over length* Δt *with characteristic function* $\phi_\ell^{\Delta t}$. *Assume there is a* $\widetilde{\Delta} > 0$ *and for every* $\Delta t \in (0, \widetilde{\Delta}]$ *there are constants* $R, \eta, B, \theta > 0$ *independent of* Δt *such that either*

- $F_{\Delta t}$ *is continuously differentiable with finite variance and* $F(-x), 1 - F(x) \leq Rx^{-\eta}$ *for* $x > 0$ *with* $\eta > 1$ *and* $|\phi_\ell(u)^{\Delta t}| \leq B|u|^{-\theta}$ *for* $u \in \mathbb{R}$

or

- $F_{\Delta t}$ *is continuously differentiable,* $f(x) \leq R|x|^{-\eta}$ *for* $x \in \mathbb{R}$ *with* $\eta > 2$ *and* $|\phi_\ell(u)^{\Delta t}| \leq B|u|^{-\theta}$ *for* $u \in \mathbb{R}$.

Let $T > 0$, $\Delta t = T/n$ *for some* $n \geq 1$, *and* $\widetilde{\ell}_F$ *be the piecewise constant approximation of* ℓ *which is generated by Algorithm 3.7 via an approximation* $\widetilde{F}_{\Delta t}$ *of* $F_{\Delta t}$. *If* $p \in [1, \eta)$ *resp.* $p \in [1, \eta - 1)$, *it is possible to choose* ε *and* $D = C\varepsilon^{-d}$ *(where* $C > 0$ *and* $0 < d < 1/p$*) such that*

$$\mathbb{E}(|\ell(t) - \widetilde{\ell}_F(t)|^p) = 0 \quad \text{as } n \to \infty$$

for each $t \in \mathbb{T}$.

Proof. Let $t \in \mathbb{T}$ and $\Delta t = T/n$ with $n \geq 1$. Define $n_t := \lfloor t/\Delta t \rfloor$ and for $j = 1, \ldots, n_t$ the random variables $X_j = \ell(j\Delta t) - \ell((j-1)\Delta t) \stackrel{\mathcal{L}}{=} \ell(\Delta t)$ and denote by $\widetilde{X}_j$ their approximations

by which $\widetilde{\ell}_F$ is generated. We rewrite

$$\begin{aligned}\ell(t) - \widetilde{\ell}_F(t) =& \sum_{j=1}^{n_t} \ell(j\Delta t) - \ell((j-1)\Delta t) - \widetilde{\ell}_F(j\Delta t) + \widetilde{\ell}_F((j-1)\Delta t) \\ &+ \ell(t) - \ell(n_t\Delta t) - \widetilde{\ell}_F(t) + \widetilde{\ell}_F(n_t\Delta t) \\ =& \sum_{j=1}^{n_t} X_j - \widetilde{X}_j + \ell(t) - \ell(n_t\Delta t),\end{aligned}$$

as $\widetilde{\ell}_F(t) - \widetilde{\ell}_F(n_t\Delta t) = 0$. Let $\widetilde{F}$ be the approximation for some $\varepsilon \in (0,1]$ and $D = C\varepsilon^{-d}$. For the first set of assumptions, we apply Minkowki's inequality and the error estimates of Theorem 3.9 to obtain

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{E}(|\ell(t) - \widetilde{\ell}_F(t)|^p)^{1/p} &\leq \sum_{j=1}^{n_t} \mathbb{E}(|X_j - \widetilde{X}_j|^p)^{1/p} + \mathbb{E}(|\ell(t) - \ell(n_t\Delta t)|^p)^{1/p} \\ &< n_t\big(2^p pR\zeta(\eta + 1 - p, C\varepsilon^{-d}/2) + C^p\varepsilon^{1-dp}\big)^{1/p} + \mathbb{E}(|\ell(t - n_t\Delta t)|^p)^{1/p} \\ &\leq n2C_{R,\eta,p}\varepsilon^{\psi(p)/p} + \mathbb{E}(|\ell(\Delta t)|^p)^{1/p}\end{aligned}$$

where $C_{R,\eta,p} > 0$ is constant depending on C and the indicated parameters and, similarly to ψ in Corollary 3.14, $\psi(p) := \min(d(\eta + 1 - p), 1 - dp)$. Note that $C_{R,\eta,p}$ remains constant as $\Delta t \to 0$, since the bounds that determine $C_{R,\eta,p}$ hold for each $\Delta t \leq \widetilde{\Delta}$. Since $\mathbb{E}(|\ell(\Delta t)|^p) = \mathbb{E}(|X_j|^p) < \infty$ by assumption and $|\ell(\Delta t)|^p \to 0$ $\mathbb{P}$-a.s. as $\Delta t \to 0$, we have by the dominated convergence theorem that

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} \mathbb{E}(|\ell(\Delta t)|^p) = 0.$$

The claim follows by choosing $\varepsilon = \varepsilon(n)$ such that $n\varepsilon(n)^{\psi(p)/p} \to 0$ as $n \to \infty$. The proof for the second set of assumptions is carried out identically with the only difference that $\psi(p) := \min(d(\eta - p), 1 - dp)$. □

Remark 3.17. For an efficient simulation one would not use a fixed R for several step sizes Δt, but rather choose R based on $\phi_\ell^{\Delta t}$ as in Remark 3.4 and then C based on R as suggested in Remark 3.12. Note that in this case $R = \mathcal{O}(\Delta t)$ and

$$C = \kappa\,(3/2\,RV_1(\kappa,\eta))^{1/\eta} = \mathcal{O}(\Delta t^{1/\eta}) \quad \text{resp.} \quad C = \kappa\,(3/2\,RV_2(\kappa,\eta))^{1/(\eta-1)} = \mathcal{O}(\Delta t^{1/(\eta-1)})$$

as $\Delta t \to 0$. This has to be considered during the simulation of $\widetilde{\ell}_F$ for different Δt as we point out in the setting of Assumption 3.2: As shown in Corollary 3.16, the L^p-error $\mathbb{E}(|\ell(t) - \widetilde{\ell}_F(t)|^p)$ may be bounded by

$$\mathbb{E}(|\ell(t) - \widetilde{\ell}_F(t)|^p)^{1/p} < n\Big(2^p pR\zeta(\eta + 1 - p, C\varepsilon^{-d}/2) + C^p\varepsilon^{1-dp}\Big)^{1/p} + \mathbb{E}(|\ell(\Delta t)|^p)^{1/p}$$

By substituting $\varepsilon = C^{1/d}D^{-1/d}$, $d = 1/\eta$ (see Remark 3.12) and $n = T/\Delta t$ one obtains

$$\mathbb{E}(|\ell(t) - \widetilde{\ell}_F(t)|^p)^{1/p} < T\Delta t^{-1}\left(2^p pR\zeta(\eta + 1 - p, D/2) + C^\eta D^{p-\eta}\right)^{1/p} + \mathbb{E}(|\ell(\Delta t)|^p)^{1/p}, \tag{3.4}$$

Since ℓ is a Lévy-process, we have that $\mathbb{E}(|\ell(\Delta t)|^p) = \mathcal{O}(\Delta t)$. Recall that $R = \mathcal{O}(\Delta t)$ and $C = \mathcal{O}(\Delta t^{1/\eta})$, which implies with Ineq. (3.4)

$$\mathbb{E}(|\ell(t) - \widetilde{\ell}_F(t)|^p) = \mathcal{O}(\Delta t^{1-p}D^{p-\eta-1}) + \mathcal{O}(\Delta t^{1-p}D^{p-\eta}) + \mathcal{O}(\Delta t) = \mathcal{O}(\Delta t^{1-p}D^{p-\eta}) + \mathcal{O}(\Delta t).$$

To guarantee $\widetilde{\ell}_F \overset{L^p}{\to} \ell$ and equilibrate both error contributions as $\Delta t \to 0$, one should set $D := D(\Delta t) = \Delta t^{p/(p-\eta)}$ during the simulation which leads to an L^p-error of order $\mathcal{O}(\Delta t)$.

As mentioned in the end of Section 2, the one-dimensional processes $(\widetilde{\ell}_i, i = 1, \dots, N)$ in the spectral decomposition are not independent, but merely uncorrelated. In the next section we introduce a class of Lévy fields for which uncorrelated processes can be obtained using the Fourier inversion. Furthermore, for the simulation of these processes the Inverse Fourier method may be employed and a bound for the constant C_ℓ (see Theorem 2.3) can be derived.

4. Generalized hyperbolic Lévy processes

Distributions which belong to the class of generalized hyperbolic distributions may be used for a wide range of applications. GH distributions have been first introduced in [2] to model mass-sizes in aeolian sand (see also [3]). Since then they have been successfully applied, among others, in Finance and Biology. Giving a broad class the distributions are characterized by six parameters, famous representatives are the Student's t, the normal-inverse Gaussian, the hyperbolic and the variance-gamma distribution. The popularity of GH processes is explained by their flexibility in modeling various characteristics of a distribution such as asymmetries or heavy tails. A further advantage in our setting is, that the characteristic function is known and, therefore, the Fourier Inversion may be applied to approximate these processes. This section is devoted to investigate several properties of multidimensional GH processes which are then used to construct an approximation of an infinite-dimensional GH field. In contrast to the Gaussian case, the GH distribution has in general no convolution property in the sense that the sum of independent and possibly scaled GH processes form again a GH process. We show a possibility to approximate GH Lévy fields via Karhunen-Loève expansions in such a way that the approximated field is itself again a GH Lévy field. This is essential, so as to have convergence of the approximation to a GH Lévy field in the sense of Theorem 2.3. Furthermore, we give a representation of a N-dimensional GH process as a subordinated Brownian motion and show how a multidimensional GH process may be constructed from uncorrelated, one-dimensional GH processes with given parameters. This may be exploited by the Fourier inversion algorithm in such a way that the computational expenses to simulate the approximated GH fields are virtually independent of the truncation index N.

Assume, for $N \in \mathbb{N}$, that $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}$, $\alpha > 0$, $\beta \in \mathbb{R}^N$, $\delta > 0$, $\mu \in \mathbb{R}^N$ and Γ is a symmetric, positive definite (spd) $N \times N$-matrix with unit determinant. We denote by $GH_N(\lambda, \alpha, \beta, \delta, \mu, \Gamma)$ the N-dimensional generalized hyperbolic distribution with probability density function

$$f_{GH_N}(x; \lambda, \alpha, \beta, \delta, \mu, \Gamma) = \frac{\gamma^\lambda \alpha^{N/2-\lambda}}{(2\pi)^{N/2}\delta^\lambda K_\lambda(\delta\gamma)} \frac{K_{\lambda-N/2}(\alpha g(x-\mu))}{g(x-\mu)^{N/2-\lambda}} \exp(\beta'(x-\mu)) \tag{4.1}$$

for $x \in \mathbb{R}^N$, where

$$g(x) := \sqrt{\delta^2 + x'\Gamma x}, \quad \gamma^2 := \alpha^2 - \beta'\Gamma\beta$$

and $K_\lambda(\cdot)$ is the modified Bessel-function of the second kind with λ degrees of freedom. The characteristic function of $GH_N(\lambda, \alpha, \beta, \delta, \mu, \Gamma)$ is given by

$$\begin{aligned}\phi_{GH_N}(u; \lambda, \alpha, \beta, \delta, \mu, \Gamma) := &\exp(iu'\mu) \left(\frac{\alpha^2 - \beta'\Gamma\beta}{\alpha^2 - (iu+\beta)'\Gamma(iu+\beta)} \right)^{\lambda/2} \\ &\cdot \frac{K_\lambda(\delta(\alpha^2 - (iu+\beta)'\Gamma(iu+\beta))^{1/2})}{K_\lambda(\delta\gamma)},\end{aligned} \tag{4.2}$$

where A' denotes the transpose of a matrix or vector A. For simplicity, we assume that the condition

$$\alpha^2 > \beta'\Gamma\beta \tag{4.3}$$

is satisfied[2]. If $N = 1$, clearly, $\Gamma = 1$ is the only possible choice for the "matrix parameter" Γ, thus we omit it in this case and denote the one-dimensional GH distribution by $GH(\lambda, \alpha, \beta, \delta, \mu)$. Barndorff–Nielsen obtains the GH distribution in [3] as a normal variance-mean mixture of a N-dimensional normal distribution and a (one-dimensional) generalized inverse Gaussian (GIG) distribution with density function

$$f_{GIG}(x; a, b, p) = \frac{(b/a)^p}{2K_p(ab)} x^{p-1} \exp(-\frac{1}{2}(a^2 x^{-1} + b^2 x)), \quad x > 0$$

and parameters $a, b > 0$ and $p \in \mathbb{R}$ [3]. To be more precise: let $W^N(1)$ be a N-dimensional standard normally distributed random vector, Γ a spd $N \times N$-structure matrix with unit determinant and $\ell^{GIG}(1)$ a $GIG(a, b, p)$ random variable, which is independent of $W^N(1)$. For $\mu, \beta \in \mathbb{R}^N$, we set $\delta = a$, $\lambda = p$, $\alpha = \sqrt{b^2 + \beta'\Gamma\beta}$ and define the random variable $\ell^{GH_N}(1)$ as

$$\ell^{GH_N}(1) := \mu + \Gamma\beta\ell^{GIG}(1) + \sqrt{\ell^{GIG}(1)\Gamma} W^N(1). \tag{4.4}$$

Then $\ell^{GH_N}(1)$ is $GH_N(\lambda, \alpha, \beta, \delta, \mu, \Gamma)$-distributed, where $\sqrt{\Gamma}$ denotes the Cholesky decomposition of the matrix Γ. With this in mind, one can draw samples of a GH distribution with given parameters by sampling multivariate normal and GIG-distributed random variables, as $a = \delta > 0$ and $b = \sqrt{\alpha^2 - \beta'\Gamma\beta} > 0$ is guaranteed by the conditions on the GIG parameters (this results in Eq. (4.3) being fulfilled).

As noted in [13, Section 5], for general $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}$, we cannot assume that the increments of the GH Lévy process (resp. of the subordinating process) over a time length other than one follow a GH distribution (resp. GIG distribution). If $N = 1$, however, the (one-dimensional) GH Lévy process ℓ^{GH} has the representation

$$\ell^{GH}(t) \stackrel{\mathcal{L}}{=} \mu t + \beta\ell^{GIG}(t) + W^1(\ell^{GIG}(t)), \quad \text{for } t \geq 0, \tag{4.5}$$

where W^1 is a one-dimensional Brownian motion and ℓ^{GIG} a GIG process independent of W^1 (see [12]). This result yields the following generalization:

Lemma 4.1. *For $N \in \mathbb{N}$, the N-dimensional process $\ell^{GH_N} = (\ell^{GH_N}(t), t \in \mathbb{T})$, which is $GH_N(\lambda, \alpha, \beta, \delta, \mu, \Gamma)$-distributed, can be represented as a subordinated N-dimensional Brownian motion W^N via*

$$\ell^{GH_N}(t) \stackrel{\mathcal{L}}{=} \mu t + \Gamma\beta\ell^{GIG}(t) + \sqrt{\Gamma} W^N(\ell^{GIG}(t)), \tag{4.6}$$

where $(\ell^{GIG}(t), t \in \mathbb{T})$ is a GIG Lévy process independent of W^N and $\sqrt{\Gamma}$ is the Cholesky decomposition of Γ.

Proof. Since the $GH_N(\lambda, \alpha, \beta, \delta, \mu, \Gamma)$ distribution may be represented as a normal variance-mean mixture (see Eq. (4.4)), we have, that

$$\ell^{GH_N}(1) \stackrel{\mathcal{L}}{=} \mu + \Gamma\beta\ell^{GIG}(1) + \sqrt{\Gamma\ell^{GIG}(1)} W^N(1) \stackrel{\mathcal{L}}{=} \mu + \Gamma\beta\ell^{GIG}(1) + \sqrt{\Gamma} W^N(\ell^{GIG}(1))$$

[2] If $\alpha^2 = \beta'\Gamma\beta$ and $\lambda < 0$, the distribution is still well-defined, but one has to consider the limit $\gamma \to 0^+$ in the Bessel functions, see [10, 27].

[3] The notation of the GIG distribution varies throughout the literature, we use the notation from [29].

where $\ell^{GIG}(1) \sim GIG(\delta, \sqrt{\alpha^2 - \beta'\Gamma\beta}, \lambda)$ and W^N is a N-dimensional Brownian motion independent of $\ell^{GIG}(1)$. The characteristic function of the mixed density is then given by

$$\phi_{GH_N}(u; \lambda, \alpha, \beta, \delta, \mu, \Gamma) = \exp(iu'\mu) M_{GIG}(iu'\Gamma\beta - \frac{1}{2}u'\Gamma u; \delta, \sqrt{\alpha^2 - \beta'\Gamma\beta}, \lambda),$$

where M_{GIG} denotes the moment generating function of $\ell^{GIG}(1)$ (see [5]). The GIG distribution is infinitely divisible, thus a GIG Lévy process $\ell^{GIG} = (\ell^{GIG}(t), t \in \mathbb{T})$ with indicated parameters can be defined via its characteristic function for $t \in \mathbb{T}$:

$$\mathbb{E}(\exp(iu\ell^{GIG}(t))) = M_{GIG}(iu; \delta, \sqrt{\alpha^2 - \beta'\Gamma\beta}, \lambda)^t.$$

The infinite divisibility yields further

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{E}\big(\exp(iu'\ell^{GH_N}(t))\big) &= \mathbb{E}\big(\exp(iu'\ell^{GH_N}(1))\big)^t = \phi_{GH}(u; \lambda, \alpha, \beta, \delta, \mu, \Gamma)^t \\ &= \exp(iu'(\mu t)) M_{GIG}(iu'\Gamma\beta - \frac{1}{2}u'\Gamma u; \delta, \sqrt{\alpha^2 - \beta'\Gamma\beta}, \lambda)^t.\end{aligned}$$

The above expression is the characteristic function of another normal variance-mean mixture, namely where the subordinator ℓ^{GIG} is a GIG process with characteristic function

$$\mathbb{E}(\exp(iu\ell^{GIG}(t))) = M_{GIG}(iu; \delta, \sqrt{\alpha^2 - \beta'\Gamma\beta}, \lambda)^t.$$

Hence, $\ell^{GH_N}(t)$ can be expressed as

$$\ell^{GH_N}(t) \stackrel{\mathcal{L}}{=} \mu t + \Gamma\beta\ell^{GIG}(t) + \sqrt{\Gamma} W^N(\ell^{GIG}(t)).$$

□

Remark 4.2. In the special case of $\lambda = -\frac{1}{2}$ one obtains the normal inverse Gaussian (NIG) distribution. The mixing density is, in this case, the inverse Gaussian (IG) distribution. We denote the N-dimensional NIG distribution by $NIG_N(\alpha, \beta, \delta, \mu, \Gamma)$. This is the only subclass of GH distributions which is closed under convolutions in the sense that (see [22])

$$NIG_N(\alpha, \beta, \delta_1, \mu_1, \Gamma) * NIG_N(\alpha, \beta, \delta_2, \mu_2, \Gamma) = NIG_N(\alpha, \beta, \delta_1 + \delta_2, \mu_1 + \mu_2, \Gamma).$$

For $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}$, the sum of independent GH random variables is in general not GH-distributed.

As shown in [4], the GH and the GIG distribution are infinitely-divisible, thus we can define the N-dimensional GH Lévy process $\ell^{GH_N} = (\ell^{GH_N}(t), t \in \mathbb{T})$ with characteristic function

$$\mathbb{E}(\exp(iu\ell^{GH_N}(t)) = \phi_{GH_N}(u; \lambda, \alpha, \beta, \delta, \mu, \Gamma)^t.$$

Remark 4.3. If $\lambda = -\frac{1}{2}$, the corresponding NIG Lévy process $(\ell^{NIG_N}(t), t \in \mathbb{T})$ has characteristic function

$$\mathbb{E}[\exp(iu\ell^{NIG_N}(t))] = \phi_{GH_N}(u; -\frac{1}{2}, \alpha, \beta, \delta, \mu, \Gamma)^t = \phi_{GH_N}(u; -\frac{1}{2}, \alpha, \beta, t\delta, t\mu, \Gamma).$$

This is due to the fact that the characteristic function $\phi_{IG}(u; a, b)$ of the mixing IG distribution fulfills the identity

$$\phi_{IG}(u; a, b)^t = \phi_{IG}(u; ta, b)$$

for any $t \in \mathbb{T}$ and $a, b > 0$ (see [29]).

We consider the finite time horizon $\mathbb{T} = [0, T]$, for $T < +\infty$, the probability space $(\Omega, (\mathcal{F}_t, t \geq 0), \mathbb{P})$, and a compact domain $\mathcal{D} \subset \mathbb{R}^s$ for $s \in \mathbb{N}$ to define a GH Lévy field as a mapping

$$L^{GH} : \Omega \times \mathcal{D} \times \mathbb{T} \to \mathbb{R}, \quad (\omega, x, t) \mapsto L^{GH}(\omega)(x)(t),$$

such that for each $x \in \mathcal{D}$ the mapping

$$L^{GH}(\cdot)(x)(\cdot) : \Omega \times \mathbb{T} \to \mathbb{R}, \quad (\omega, t) \mapsto L^{GH}(\omega)(x)(t),$$

is a one-dimensional GH Lévy process on $(\Omega, (\mathcal{F}_t, t \geq 0), \mathbb{P})$ with characteristic function

$$\mathbb{E}\big(\exp(iuL^{GH}(x)(t))\big) = \phi_{GH}(u; \lambda(x), \alpha(x), \beta(x), \delta(x), \mu(x))^t,$$

where the indicated parameters depend on x and fulfill condition (4.3). This, in turn, means that L^{GH} takes values in the Hilbert space $H = L^2(\mathcal{D})$ and is square integrable because

$$\mathbb{E}(||L^{GH}(t)||_H^2) \leq T\mathbb{E}(||L^{GH}(1)||_H^2) \leq T\sqrt{\max_{x \in \mathcal{D}} \mathbb{E}(L^{GH}(x)(1)^2)}V_{\mathcal{D}}.$$

where $V_{\mathcal{D}}$ denotes the volume of $\mathcal{D}$. The right hand side is well-defined and finite since every GH distribution has finite variance (see for example [20, 29]) and $\mathcal{D} \subset \mathbb{R}^s$ is compact by assumption. We use the Karhunen-Loève expansion from Section 2 to obtain an approximation of a given GH Lévy field. For this purpose, we consider the truncated sums

$$L_N^{GH}(x)(t) := \sum_{i=1}^{N} \varphi_i(x)\Big(\mu_i t + \beta_i \ell_i^{GIG}(t) + W_i(\ell_i^{GIG}(t))\Big),$$

where $N \in \mathbb{N}$ and $\mu_i, \beta_i \in \mathbb{R}$, for $i = 1, \ldots, N$ are parameters of a one-dimensional GH distribution. Furthermore, for each i the process $(\ell_i^{GIG}(t), t \in \mathbb{T})$ is a GIG Lévy process with parameters $a_i, b_i > 0$ and $p_i \in \mathbb{R}$, $(W_i(t), t \in \mathbb{T})$ is a one-dimensional Brownian motion independent of ℓ_i^{GIG} and $\varphi_i(x) = \sqrt{\rho_i}e_i(x)$ is the i-th component of the spectral basis evaluated at the spatial point x. In addition, all Brownian motions $W_1, \ldots, W_N$ are mutually independent of each other, but the processes $\ell_1^{GIG}, \ldots, \ell_N^{GIG}$ may be correlated. From Theorem 2.3 follows that L_N^{GH} converges in $L^2(\Omega; H)$ to L^{GH} as $N \to \infty$. If we define

$$\ell_i^{GH}(t) := \mu_i t + \beta_i \ell_i^{GIG}(t) + W_i(\ell_i^{GIG}(t)), \tag{4.7}$$

then $\ell_i^{GH} := (\ell_i^{GH}(t), t \in \mathbb{T})$ is a $GH(\lambda_i, \alpha_i, \beta_i, \delta_i, \mu_i)$ Lévy process, where $\lambda_i = p_i$, $\alpha_i = (b_i^2 + \beta_i^2)^{1/2}$ and $\delta_i = a_i$. We want the approximation $(L_N^{GH}(x)(t), t \in \mathbb{T})$ to be a GH process for arbitrary φ_i and $x \in \mathcal{D}$. Remark 4.2 suggests that this cannot be achieved by the summation of independent ℓ_i^{GH}, but rather by using correlated subordinators $\ell_1^{GIG}, \ldots, \ell_N^{GIG}$. Before we determine the correlation structure of the subordinators, we establish a necessary and sufficient condition on the ℓ_i^{GH} to achieve the desired distribution of the approximation.

Lemma 4.4. *Let $N \in \mathbb{N}$, $t \in \mathbb{T}$ and $(\ell_i^{GH}, i = 1 \ldots, N)$ be GH processes as defined in Eq. (4.7). For arbitrary numbers $a_1, \ldots, a_N \in \mathbb{R} \setminus \{0\}$, the process L_N^{GH} defined by*

$$L_N^{GH}(t) := \sum_{i=1}^{N} a_i \ell_i^{GH}(t) = \sum_{i=1}^{N} a_i(\mu_i + \beta_i \ell_i^{GIG}(t) + W_i(\ell_i^{GIG}(t)))$$

is a one-dimensional GH process, if and only if the vector $\ell^{GH_N}(1) := (\ell_1^{GH}(1), \ldots, \ell_N^{GH}(1))'$ is multivariate $GH_N(\lambda^{(N)}, \alpha^{(N)}, \beta^{(N)}, \delta^{(N)}, \mu^{(N)}, \Gamma)$-distributed with parameters $\lambda^{(N)}, \alpha^{(N)}$, $\delta^{(N)} \in \mathbb{R}$, $\beta^{(N)}, \mu^{(N)} \in \mathbb{R}^N$ and structure matrix $\Gamma \in \mathbb{R}^{N \times N}$.

Proof. We first consider the case that $\ell^{GH_N}(1) \sim GH_N(\lambda^{(N)}, \alpha^{(N)}, \beta^{(N)}, \delta^{(N)}, \mu^{(N)}, \Gamma)$. It is sufficient to show that $L_N^{GH}(1)$ is a GH-distributed random variable, the infinite divisibility of the GH distribution then implies that $(L_N^{GH}(t), t \in \mathbb{T})$ is a GH process. Since the coefficients $a_1, \dots, a_N$ are non-zero, there exists a non-singular $N \times N$ matrix A, such that $L_N^{GH}(1)$ is the first component of the vector $A\ell^{GH_N}(1)$. If $\ell^{GH_N}(1)$ is multidimensional GH-distributed, we get by [10, Theorem 1], that $A\ell^{GH_N}(1)$ is also multidimensional GH and that the first component of $A\ell^{GH_N}(1)$, namely $L_N^{GH}(1)$, follows a one-dimensional GH distribution (the parameters of the distribution of $L_N^{GH}(1)$ depend on A and on $\lambda^{(N)}, \alpha^{(N)}, \beta^{(N)}, \delta^{(N)}, \mu^{(N)}, \Gamma$ and are explicitly given in [10] and below).
On the other hand, assume that $L_N^{GH}(1)$ is a GH random variable (with arbitrary coefficients), but $\ell^{GH_N}(1)$ is not N-dimensional GH-distributed. This means there is no representation of $\ell^{GH_N}(1)$ such that

$$\ell^{GH_N}(1) \stackrel{\mathcal{L}}{=} \mu + \Gamma\beta\ \ell^{GIG}(1) + \sqrt{\Gamma} W^N(\ell^{GIG}(1))$$

with $\mu, \beta \in \mathbb{R}^N$, $\Gamma \in \mathbb{R}^{N\times N}$ spd with determinant one, a GIG random variable $\ell^{GIG}(1)$ and a N-dimensional Brownian motion W^N independent of $\ell^{GIG}(1)$. This implies that $L_N^{GH}(1) = (A\ell^{GH_N}(1))_1$ has no representation

$$\begin{aligned} L_N^{GH}(1) &= (A\mu)_1 + (A\Gamma\beta)_1 \ell^{GIG}(1) + (A\sqrt{\Gamma} W^N(\ell^{GIG}(1)))_1 \\ &\stackrel{\mathcal{L}}{=} (A\mu)_1 + (A\Gamma\beta)_1 \ell^{GIG}(1) + \sqrt{\ell^{GIG}(1) A_{[1]}\Gamma A_{[1]}'}\, W^1(1), \end{aligned}$$

where $A_{[1]}$ denotes the first row of the matrix A and $W^1(1) \sim \mathcal{N}(0,1)$. For the last equality we have used the affine linear transformation property of multidimensional normal distributions and that Γ is positive definite. Since $c_A := A_{[1]}\Gamma A_{[1]}' > 0$, we can divide the upper equation by $(c_A)^{1/2}$ and obtain that $c_A^{-1/2} L_N^{GH}(1)$ cannot be a GH-distributed random variable, as it can not be expressed as a normal variance-mean mixture with a GIG-distributed random variable. But this is a contradiction, since $L_N^{GH}(1)$ is GH-distributed by assumption and the class of GH distributions is closed under regular affine linear transformations (see [10, Theorem 1c]). □

Remark 4.5. The condition $a_i \neq 0$ is not necessary for the above statement. If, for $k \in \{1, \dots, N-1\}$, k coefficients $a_{i_1} = \dots = a_{i_k} = 0$, then the summation reduces to

$$L_N(t) = \sum_{i=1}^{N} a_i \ell_i^{GH}(t) = \sum_{l=1}^{N-k} a_{j_l} \ell_{j_l}^{GH}(t),$$

where the indices j_l are chosen such that $a_{j_l} \neq 0$ for $l = 1, \dots, N-k$. If $P \in \mathbb{R}^{N\times N}$ is the permutation matrix with

$$P\ell^{GH_N}(1) = P(\ell_1^{GH}(1), \dots, \ell_N^{GH}(1))' = (\ell_{j_1}^{GH}(1), \dots, \ell_{j_{N-k}}^{GH}(1), \ell_{i_1}^{GH}(1), \dots, \ell_{i_k}^{GH}(1))',$$

then P is again N-dimensionally GH-distributed and by [10, Theorem 1a] the vector $(\ell_{j_1}^{GH}(1), \dots, \ell_{j_{N-k}}^{GH}(1))$ has a $(N-k)$-dimensional GH law. Thus, we only consider the case where all coefficients are non-vanishing.

The previous proposition states that the KL approximation

$$L_N^{GH}(x)(t) = \sum_{i=1}^{N} \varphi_i(x) \ell_i^{GH}(t),$$

can only be a GH process for arbitrary $(\varphi_i(x), i = 1, \dots, N)$ if the ℓ_i^{GH} are correlated in such a way that they form a multidimensional GH process. This rules out the possibility of independent processes $(\ell_i^{GH}, i = 1, \dots, N)$, because if $\ell^{GH_N}(1)$ is multidimensional GH-distributed, it is not possible that the marginals $\ell_i^{GH}(1)$ are independent GH-distributed random variables (see [10]). The parameters $\lambda_i, \alpha_i, \beta_i, \delta_i, \mu_i$ of ℓ_i^{GH} should remain as unrestricted as possible for each $i = 1, \dots, N$, so we determine in the next step the parameters of the marginals of a $GH_N(\lambda^{(N)}, \alpha^{(N)}, \beta^{(N)}, \delta^{(N)}, \mu^{(N)}, \Gamma)$ distribution and show how the subordinators $(\ell_i^{GIG}, i = 1, \dots, N)$ might be correlated. For this purpose, we introduce the notation $A^{-\prime} := (A^{-1})'$ if A is an invertible square matrix. The following result allows us to determine the marginal distributions of a N-dimensional GH distribution.

Lemma 4.6. *(Masuda* [20]*, who refers to* [11]*, Lemma A.1.) Let*

$$\ell^{GH_N}(1) = (\ell_1^{GH}(1), \dots, \ell_N^{GH}(1))' \sim GH_N(\lambda^{(N)}, \alpha^{(N)}, \beta^{(N)}, \delta^{(N)}, \mu^{(N)}, \Gamma),$$

then for each i we have that $\ell_i^{GH}(1) \sim GH(\lambda_i, \alpha_i, \beta_i, \delta_i, \mu_i)$, where

$$\lambda_i = \lambda^{(N)}, \quad \alpha_i = \Gamma_{ii}^{-1/2} \left[(\alpha^{(N)})^2 - \beta'_{-i} \left(\Gamma_{-i,22} - \Gamma_{-i,21} \Gamma_{ii}^{-1} \Gamma_{-i,12} \right) \beta_{-i} \right]^{1/2}$$
$$\beta_i = \beta_i^{(N)} + \Gamma_{ii}^{-1} \Gamma_{-i,12} \beta_{-i}, \quad \delta_i = \sqrt{\Gamma_{ii}} \delta_i^{(N)}, \quad \mu_i = \mu_i^{(N)},$$

together with

$$\beta_{-i} := (\beta_1^{(N)}, \dots, \beta_{i-1}^{(N)}, \beta_{i+1}^{(N)}, \dots, \beta_N^{(N)})',$$
$$\Gamma_{-i,12} := (\Gamma_{i,1}, \dots, \Gamma_{i,i-1}, \Gamma_{i,i+1}, \dots, \Gamma_{i,N}), \quad \Gamma_{-i,21} := \Gamma'_{-i,12}$$

and $\Gamma_{-i,22}$ denotes the $(N-1) \times (N-1)$ matrix which is obtained by removing the i-th row and column of Γ.

Assume that $\ell^{GH_N}(1) \sim GH_N(\lambda^{(N)}, \alpha^{(N)}, \beta^{(N)}, \delta^{(N)}, \mu^{(N)}, \Gamma)$, because this is necessary (and sufficient) for the KL expansion to be a GH process. Lemma 4.6 gives us immediately, that for all $i = 1, \dots, N$, the parameters $\lambda_i = \lambda^{(N)}$ have to be identical, whereas the drift μ_i may be chosen arbitrary for each process ℓ_i^{GH}. Furthermore, the expectation and covariance matrix of $\ell^{GH_N}(1)$ is given by

$$\mathbb{E}(\ell^{GH_N}(1)) = \mu^{(N)} + \frac{\delta^{(N)} K_{\lambda^{(N)}+1}(\delta^{(N)}\gamma^{(N)})}{\gamma^{(N)} K_{\lambda^{(N)}}(\delta^{(N)}\gamma^{(N)})} \Gamma \beta^{(N)} \tag{4.8}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} \mathrm{Var}(\ell^{GH_N}(1)) &= \frac{\delta^{(N)} K_{\lambda^{(N)}+1}(\delta^{(N)}\gamma^{(N)})}{\gamma^{(N)} K_{\lambda^{(N)}}(\delta^{(N)}\gamma^{(N)})} \Gamma \\ &+ \left(\frac{\delta^{(N)}}{\gamma^{(N)}} \right)^2 \frac{K_{\lambda^{(N)}+2}(\delta^{(N)}\gamma^{(N)}) K_{\lambda^{(N)}}(\delta^{(N)}\gamma^{(N)}) - K^2_{\lambda^{(N)}+1}(\delta^{(N)}\gamma^{(N)})}{K^2_{\lambda^{(N)}}(\delta^{(N)}\gamma^{(N)})} (\Gamma\beta^{(N)})(\Gamma\beta^{(N)})', \end{aligned} \tag{4.9}$$

where $\gamma^{(N)} := ((\alpha^{(N)})^2 - \beta^{(N)\prime} \Gamma \beta^{(N)})^{1/2}$ (see [20]).

Example 4.7. Consider the case that the processes $\ell_1^{GH}, \dots, \ell_N^{GH}$ are generated by the same subordinating $GIG(a, b, p)$ process ℓ^{GIG}, i.e.

$$\ell_i^{GH}(t) = \mu_i t + \beta_i \ell^{GIG}(t) + W_i(\ell^{GIG}(t)).$$

Then $\ell_i^{GH}(1) \sim GH(\lambda, \alpha_i, \beta_i, \delta, \mu_i)$, where $\lambda = p$, $\delta = a$ are independent of i and $\alpha_i = (b^2 + \beta_i^2)^{1/2}$. If $\mu^{(N)} := (\mu_1 \ldots, \mu_N)'$, $\beta^{(N)} := (\beta_1, \ldots, \beta_N)'$ and Γ is the $N \times N$ identity matrix, then

$$\begin{aligned}\ell^{GH_N}(t) = (\ell_1^{GH}(t), \ldots, \ell_N^{GH}(t))' &\stackrel{\mathcal{L}}{=} \mu t + \beta \ell^{GIG}(t) + W^N(\ell^{GIG}(t)) \\ &= \mu t + \Gamma\beta\ell^{GIG}(t) + \sqrt{\Gamma} W^N(\ell^{GIG}(t)),\end{aligned}$$

where W^N is a N-dimensional Brownian motion independent of ℓ^{GIG}. Hence, $\ell^{GH_N}(t)$ is a multidimensional $GH(\lambda, \alpha^{(N)}, \beta^{(N)}, \delta, \mu^{(N)}, \Gamma)$ process with $\alpha^{(N)} = \sqrt{b^2 + \beta'\beta}$. One checks using Lemma 4.6 that the parameters of the marginals of $\ell^{GH_N}(1)$ and $\ell_i^{GH}(1)$ coincide for each i, and that expectation and covariance of $\ell^{GH_N}(1)$ are given by Eq. (4.8) and (4.9).
By Lemma 4.4, we have that the Karhunen-Loève expansion

$$L_N^{GH}(x)(t) = \sum_{i=1}^{N} \varphi_i(x) \ell_i^{GH}(t)$$

in this example is a GH process for each $x \in \mathcal{D}$ and arbitrary basis functions $(\varphi_i, i = 1, \ldots, N)$.

Remark 4.8. Lemma 4.6 dictates that the subordinators $(\ell_i^{GIG}, i = 1, \ldots, N)$ cannot be independent. In Example 4.7 fully correlated subordinators were used. A different way to correlate the subordinators, so that Lemma 4.6 is fulfilled, would lead to a correlation matrix, just being multiplied with Γ. For simplicity, in the remainder of the paper, especially for the numerical examples in Section 5, we use fully correlated subordinators.

As shown in [10, Theorem 1c] the class of N-dimensional GH distributions is closed under regular linear transformations: If $N \in \mathbb{N}$, $\ell^{GH_N}(1) \sim GH_N(\lambda, \alpha, \beta, \delta, \mu, \Gamma)$, A is an invertible $N \times N$-matrix and $b \in \mathbb{R}^N$, then the random vector $A\ell^{GH_N}(1) + b$ has distribution

$$GH_N(\lambda, ||A||^{-1/N}\alpha, A^{-\prime}\beta, ||A||^{1/N}\delta, A\mu + b, ||A||^{-2/N} A\Gamma A'),$$

where $||A||$ denotes the absolute value of the determinant of A. With this and the assumption $\ell^{GH_N}(1) \sim GH_N(\lambda^{(N)}, \alpha^{(N)}, \beta^{(N)}, \delta^{(N)}, \mu^{(N)}, \Gamma)$, we are also able to determine the law of L_N^{GH} for given coefficients $\varphi_1(x), \ldots, \varphi_N(x)$.

Lemma 4.9. *Let $\ell^{GH_N}(1) \sim GH_N(\lambda^{(N)}, \alpha^{(N)}, \beta^{(N)}, \delta^{(N)}, \mu^{(N)}, \Gamma)$ and for $x \in \mathcal{D}$ let $(\varphi_i(x), i = 1, \ldots, N)$ be a sequence of non-zero coefficients (see Remark 4.5). Then $(L_N^{GH}(x)(t), t \in \mathbb{T})$ is a GH Lévy process with parameters depending on x.*

Proof. It is again sufficient to show that $L_N^{GH}(x)(1)$ follows a GH law, the resulting parameters are given below. For $x \in \mathcal{D}$, define the $N \times N$ matrix $A(x)$ via

$$A(x)_{ij} := \begin{cases} \varphi_j(x) & \text{if } i = 1 \text{ or if } i = j \\ 0 & \text{elsewhere} \end{cases}. \tag{4.10}$$

The matrix $A(x)$ is invertible with determinant $\prod_{i=1}^N \varphi_i(x) \neq 0$ and inverse $A(x)^{-1}$ given by

$$A(x)_{ij}^{-1} := \begin{cases} -\varphi_1(x)^{-1} & \text{if } i = 1 \text{ and } j \geq 2 \\ \varphi_i(x)^{-1} & \text{if } i = j \\ 0 & \text{elsewhere} \end{cases}.$$

Then $L_N^{GH}(x)(1) = \sum_{i=1}^N \varphi_i(x)\ell_i^{GH}(1)$ is the first entry of the random vector $A(x)\ell^{GH_N}(1)$. By the affine transformation property of the GH distribution and Lemma 4.6 it follows that $L_N^{GH}(x)(1)$ is one-dimensional GH-distributed. Now define $\widetilde{\Gamma} := A(x)\Gamma A(x)'$, the partition

$$\widetilde{\Gamma} = \begin{pmatrix} \widetilde{\Gamma}_{11} & \widetilde{\Gamma}'_{2,1} \\ \widetilde{\Gamma}_{2,1} & \widetilde{\Gamma}_{2,2} \end{pmatrix}$$

such that $\widetilde{\Gamma}_{2,1} \in \mathbb{R}^{N-1}$ and $\widetilde{\Gamma}_{2,2} \in \mathbb{R}^{(N-1)\times(N-1)}$ and the vector

$$\widetilde{\beta} := \left(\beta_2^{(N)}\varphi_2(x)^{-1} - \beta_1^{(N)}\varphi_1(x)^{-1}, \ldots, \beta_N^{(N)}\varphi_N(x)^{-1} - \beta_1^{(N)}\varphi_1(x)^{-1}\right)' \in \mathbb{R}^{N-1}.$$

The parameters $\lambda_L, \alpha_L(x), \beta_L(x), \delta_L(x)$ and $\mu_L(x)$ of $L_N^{GH}(x)$ are then given by

$$\begin{aligned}
\lambda_L &= \lambda^{(N)}, \\
\alpha_L(x) &= \widetilde{\Gamma}_{11}^{-1/2}\left[(\alpha^{(N)})^2 - \widetilde{\beta}'(\widetilde{\Gamma}_{2,2} - \widetilde{\Gamma}_{11}^{-1}\widetilde{\Gamma}_{2,1}\widetilde{\Gamma}'_{2,1})\widetilde{\beta}\right]^{1/2}, \\
\delta_L(x) &= \delta^{(N)}\sqrt{\widetilde{\Gamma}_{11}} = \delta^{(N)}\Big(\sum_{i,j=1}^N \varphi_i(x)\varphi_j(x)\Gamma_{ij}\Big)^{1/2}, \\
\beta_L(x) &= \beta_1^{(N)}\varphi_1(x)^{-1} + \widetilde{\Gamma}_{11}^{-1}\widetilde{\Gamma}'_{2,1}\widetilde{\beta} \quad \text{and} \\
\mu_L(x) &= [A(x)\mu^{(N)}]_1 = \sum_{i=1}^N \varphi_i(x)\mu_i^{(N)}.
\end{aligned}$$

□

To ensure $L^2(\Omega;\mathbb{R})$ convergence as in Theorem 2.3 of the series

$$\widetilde{L}_N^{GH}(x)(t) = \sum_{i=1}^N \sqrt{\rho_i}e_i(x)\widetilde{\ell}_i^{GH}(t),$$

we need to simulate approximations of uncorrelated, one-dimensional GH processes ℓ_i^{GH} with given parameters $\ell_i^{GH}(1) \sim GH(\lambda_i, \alpha_i, \beta_i, \delta_i, \mu_i)$. To obtain a sufficiently good approximation of the Lévy field, N is coupled to the time discretization of $\mathbb{T}$ and the decay of the eigenvalues of Q (see Remark 2.4). The simulation of a large number N of independent GH processes is computationally expensive, so we focus on a different approach. Instead of generating N uncorrelated, one-dimensional processes, we generate one N-dimensional processes with decorrelated marginals. For this approach to work we need to impose some restrictions on the target parameters $\lambda_i, \alpha_i, \beta_i$ and δ_i,.

Theorem 4.10. *Let $(\ell_i^{GH}, i = 1\ldots, N)$ be one-dimensional GH processes, where, for $i = 1, \ldots, N$, $\ell_i^{GH}(1) \sim GH(\lambda_i, \alpha_i, \beta_i, \delta_i, \mu_i)$. The vector $\ell^{GH_N} := (\ell_1^{GH}, \ldots, \ell_N^{GH})'$ is only a N-dimensional GH process if there are constants $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}$ and $c > 0$ such that for any i*

$$\lambda_i = \lambda \quad \textit{and} \quad \delta_i\sqrt{\alpha_i^2 - \beta_i^2} = c.$$

If, in addition, the symmetric matrix $U \in \mathbb{R}^{N\times N}$ defined by

$$U_{ij} := \begin{cases} \delta_i^2 & \text{if } i = j \\ \frac{K_{\lambda+1}(c)^2 - K_{\lambda+2}(c)K_\lambda(c)}{K_{\lambda+1}(c)K_\lambda(c)}\frac{\beta_i\delta_i^2\beta_j\delta_j^2}{c} & \text{if } i \neq j, \end{cases}$$

is positive definite, it is possible to construct a N-dimensional GH process ℓ^U with uncorrelated marginals ℓ_i^U and

$$\ell_i^U(1) \stackrel{\mathcal{L}}{=} \ell_i^{GH}(1) \sim GH(\lambda_i, \alpha_i, \beta_i, \delta_i, \mu_i).$$

Proof. We start with the necessary condition to obtain a multidimensional GH distribution. Let ℓ^{GH_N} be a N-dimensional GH process with

$$\ell^{GH_N}(1) \sim GH_N(\lambda^{(N)}, \alpha^{(N)}, \beta^{(N)}, \delta^{(N)}, \mu^{(N)}, \Gamma).$$

If the law of the marginals of ℓ^{GH_N} is denoted by $\ell_i^{GH}(1) \sim GH(\lambda_i, \alpha_i, \beta_i, \delta_i, \mu_i)$, then one sees immediately from Lemma 4.6 that $\lambda_i = \lambda^{(N)}$ and $\mu_i = \mu_i^{(N)}$ for all $i = 1, \dots, N$. With the equations for β_i and δ_i from Lemma 4.6, we derive for $\Gamma\beta^{(N)}$

$$(\Gamma\beta^{(N)})_i = \Gamma_{ii}\beta_i^{(N)} + \sum_{k=1,k\neq i}^{N} \Gamma_{ik}\beta_k^{(N)} = \Gamma_{ii}\beta_i^{(N)} + \Gamma_{ii}(\beta_i - \beta_i^{(N)}) = \big(\frac{\delta_i}{\delta^{(N)}}\big)^2\beta_i, \tag{4.11}$$

which leads to

$$\begin{aligned}
\alpha_i^2 &= \Gamma_{ii}^{-1}(\alpha^{(N)})^2 - \Gamma_{ii}^{-1}\sum_{k=1,k\neq i}^{N}\beta_k^{(N)}\sum_{l=1,l\neq i}^{N}\Gamma_{kl}\beta_l^{(N)} + \big(\Gamma_{ii}^{-1}\sum_{k=1,k\neq i}^{N}\Gamma_{ik}\beta_k^{(N)}\big)^2 \\
&= \big(\frac{\delta^{(N)}\alpha^{(N)}}{\delta_i}\big)^2 - \big(\frac{\delta^{(N)}}{\delta_i}\big)^2\sum_{k=1,k\neq i}^{N}\beta_k^{(N)}((\Gamma\beta^{(N)})_k - \Gamma_{ik}\beta_i^{(N)}) + (\beta_i - \beta_i^{(N)})^2 \\
&= \big(\frac{\delta^{(N)}\alpha^{(N)}}{\delta_i}\big)^2 - \sum_{k=1,k\neq i}^{N}\beta_k^{(N)}\frac{\delta_k^2}{\delta_i^2}\beta_k \\
&\quad + \big(\frac{\delta^{(N)}}{\delta_i}\big)^2\beta_i^{(N)}((\Gamma\beta^{(N)})_i - \Gamma_{ii}\beta_i^{(N)}) + \beta_i^2 - 2\beta_i\beta_i^{(N)} + (\beta_i^{(N)})^2 \\
&= \big(\frac{\delta^{(N)}\alpha^{(N)}}{\delta_i}\big)^2 - \sum_{k=1}^{N}\beta_k^{(N)}\frac{\delta_k^2}{\delta_i^2}\beta_k + \beta_i^2.
\end{aligned}$$

The last equation is equivalent to

$$\delta_i^2(\alpha_i^2 - \beta_i^2) = (\delta^{(N)}\alpha^{(N)})^2 - \sum_{k=1}^{N}\beta_k^{(N)}\underbrace{\delta_k\beta_k}_{=(\delta^{(N)})^2(\Gamma\beta_k^{(N)})} = (\delta^{(N)})^2\left((\alpha^{(N)})^2 - \beta^{(N)\prime}\Gamma\beta^{(N)}\right), \tag{4.12}$$

and since the right hand side does not depend on i, we get that $\delta_i^2(\alpha_i^2 - \beta_i^2) > 0$ has to be independent of i.
Now assume we have a set of parameters $((\lambda_i, \alpha_i, \beta_i, \delta_i, \mu_i), i = 1, \dots, N)$ with

$$\delta_i\sqrt{\alpha_i^2 - \beta_i^2} = c > 0 \quad \text{and} \quad \lambda_i = \lambda \in \mathbb{R},$$

where c and λ are independent of the index i. Furthermore, let the matrix U as defined in the claim be positive definite. We show how parameters $\lambda^{(U)}, \alpha^{(U)}, \beta^{(U)}, \delta^{(U)}, \mu^{(U)}$ and $\Gamma^{(U)}$ of a N-dimensional GH process ℓ^U may be chosen, such that its marginals are uncorrelated

with law $\ell_i^U(1) \sim GH(\lambda, \alpha_i, \beta_i, \delta_i, \mu_i)$. Clearly, we set $\lambda^{(U)} := \lambda$ and $\mu^{(U)} := (\mu_1, \dots, \mu_N)'$. Equations (4.11) and (4.12) yield the conditions

$$(\delta^{(U)})^2(\Gamma^{(U)}\beta^{(U)})_i = \delta_i^2\beta_i \quad \text{and} \quad \delta^{(U)}\sqrt{(\alpha^{(U)})^2 - \beta^{(U)T}\Gamma^{(U)}\beta^{(U)}} = \delta_i\sqrt{\alpha_i^2 - \beta_i^2} = c.$$

If $(\delta^{(U)})^2\Gamma^{(U)}$ fulfills the identity $(\delta^{(U)})^2\Gamma^{(U)} = U$, we get by the covariance formula (4.9) for $i \neq j$

$$\begin{aligned}\mathrm{Cov}(\ell_i^U(1), \ell_j^U(1)) &= \frac{K_{\lambda+1}(c)}{cK_\lambda(c)}(\delta^{(U)})^2\Gamma_{U,ij} \\ &\quad + \frac{K_{\lambda+2}(c)K_\lambda(c) - K_{\lambda+1}^2(c)}{c^2K_\lambda(c)}((\delta^{(U)})^2\Gamma^{(U)}\beta^{(U)})_i((\delta^{(U)})^2\Gamma^{(U)}\beta^{(U)})_j \\ &= \frac{K_{\lambda+1}(c)}{cK_\lambda(c)}U_{ij} + \frac{K_{\lambda+2}(c)K_\lambda(c) - K_{\lambda+1}^2(c)}{c^2K_\lambda(c)}\delta_i^2\beta_i\delta_j^2\beta_j = 0,\end{aligned}$$

hence all marginals are uncorrelated. To obtain a well-defined N-dimensional GH distribution, we still have to make sure that $\Gamma^{(U)}$ is spd with unit determinant. If we define $\delta^{(U)} := (\det(U))^{1/(2N)}$, then $\delta^{(U)} > 0$ (since $\det(U) > 0$ by assumption) and $\Gamma^{(U)} = (\delta^{(U)})^{-2}U$ is spd with $\det(\Gamma^{(U)}) = 1$. It remains to determine appropriate parameters $\alpha^{(U)} > 0$ and $\beta^{(U)} \in \mathbb{R}^N$. For $\beta^{(U)}$, we use once again Lemma 4.6 to obtain the linear equations

$$\beta_i = \beta_i + (\Gamma_{ii}^{(U)})^{-1}\sum_{k=1,k\neq i}\Gamma_{ik}^{(U)}\beta_k^{(U)},$$

for $i = 1, \dots, N$. The corresponding system of linear equations is given by

$$\begin{pmatrix}(\Gamma_{11}^{(U)})^{-1} & & \\ & \ddots & \\ & & (\Gamma_{NN}^{(U)})^{-1}\end{pmatrix}\Gamma^{(U)}\beta^{(U)} = \begin{pmatrix}\beta_1 \\ \vdots \\ \beta_N\end{pmatrix},$$

and has a unique solution $\beta^{(U)}$ for any right hand side $(\beta_1, \dots, \beta_N)'$, because $\Gamma^{(U)}$ as constructed above is invertible with positive diagonal entries. Finally, we are able to calculate $\alpha^{(U)}$ via Equation (4.12) as

$$\alpha^{(U)} = \Big(\sum_{k=1}^N \delta_k^2\beta_k\beta_k^{(U)} + \big(\frac{c}{\delta^{(U)}}\big)^2\Big)^{1/2} = \Big(\beta^{(U)\prime}\Gamma^{(U)}\beta^{(U)} + \big(\frac{c}{\delta^{(U)}}\big)^2\Big)^{1/2}$$

and obtain the desired marginal distributions. □

Note that the KL-expansion $L_N^{GH}(x)(\cdot)$ generated by $(\ell_i^U, i = 1 \dots, N)$ in Theorem 4.10 is a GH process for each $x \in \mathcal{D}$ by Lemma 4.9, whereas this is not the case if the processes $(\ell_i^{GH}, i = 1, \dots, N)$ are generated independently of each other: by Lemma 4.4 we have that $L_N^{GH}(x)(1)$ is only GH distributed if the vector $(\ell_1^{GH}(1), \dots, \ell_N^{GH}(1))'$ admits a multidimensional GH law. As noted in [10] after Theorem 1, this is impossible if the processes (and hence $(\ell_i^{GH}(1), i = 1, \dots, N)$) are independent. Whenever Theorem 4.10 is applicable, we are able to approximate a GH Lévy field by generating a N-dimensional GH processes, where N is the truncation index of the KL expansion. To this end, Lemma 4.1 suggests the simulation of GIG processes and then subordinating N-dimensional Brownian motions. With this simulation approach the question arises on why we have taken a detour via the subordinating GIG process instead of using the characteristic function a of GH process in Equation (4.2)

for a "direct" simulation. This has several reasons: First, the approximation of the inversion formula (3.1) can only be applied for one-dimensional GH processes, where the costs of evaluating ϕ_{GH} or ϕ_{GIG} are roughly the same. In comparison, the costs of sampling a Brownian motion are negligible. Second, in the multidimensional case, we need that all marginals of the GH process are generated by the same or correlated subordinator(s), which leaves us no choice but to sample the underlying GIG process. In addition, the simulation of a GH field may require in some cases only one subordinating process to generate a multidimensional GH process with uncorrelated marginals (see Theorem 4.10). This approach is in general more efficient than sampling a large number of uncorrelated, one-dimensional GH processes for the KL expansion.

As we demonstrate in the following section, it is a straightforward application of the Fourier inversion algorithm to approximate a GIG process ℓ^{GIG} with given parameters, since all necessary assumptions are fulfilled and the bounding parameters η, R, θ and B may readily be calculated.

5. Numerics

In this section we provide some details on the implementation of the Fourier inversion method. Thereafter, we apply this methodology to approximate a GH Lévy field and conclude with some numerical examples.

5.1. **Notes on implementation.** Suppose we simulate a given one-dimensional Lévy process ℓ which fulfills Assumption 3.2 resp. Assumption 3.3, using the step size $\Delta t > 0$ and characteristic function $\phi_\ell^{\Delta t}$. Usually the parameter η cannot be chosen arbitrary high (as for the GIG process), but it may be possible to choose η within a certain range, i.e. $\eta \in (1, 2]$ for the Cauchy process in Example 3.13. As a rule of thumb, η should always be determined as high as possible, as the convergence rates in Theorems 3.9 and 3.11 directly depend on η. In addition, we concluded in Remark 3.17 that $D \simeq \Delta t^{p/(p-\eta)}$ is an appropriate choice to guarantee an L^p-error of order $\mathcal{O}(\Delta t)$. This means that for a given p, D decreases as η increases. Since the number of summations M in Algorithm 3.3 depends on D (see Theorem 3.5), an increasing η also reduces computational time. Once η is determined, we derive R by differentiation of $\phi_\ell^{\Delta t}$ as in Remark 3.4. Similarly to η, it is often possible to choose between several values of $\theta > 0$, but it is difficult to give a-priori a recommendation on how θ should be selected. One rather calculates for several admissible θ the constant $C_\theta := \max_{u\in\mathbb{R}} |u^\theta \phi_\ell(u)^{\Delta t}|$ numerically and deducts $B_\theta = (2\pi)^{-\theta} C_\theta$. Each combination of (θ, B_θ) then results in a valid number of summations M_θ in the discrete Fourier Inversion algorithm. Since θ and B_θ are only necessary to determine M_θ, we may simply use the smallest M_θ for the simulation. To find $\widetilde{X}$ with $\widetilde{F}(\widetilde{X}) = U$ in Algorithm 3.7, we use a globalized Newton method with *backtracking line search*, also known as *Armijo increment control*. The step lengths during the line search are determined by interpolation, which is a robust technique if combined with a standard Newton method. Details on the globalized Newton method with backtracking may be found, for example, in [21], an example how the algorithm is used is given in [25]. Although convergence of this root finding algorithm is ensured by the Armijo steps, its efficiency depends heavily on the choice of the initial value $\widetilde{X}_0$. Clearly, $\widetilde{X}_0$ should depend on the sampled $U \sim \mathcal{U}([0, 1])$ and be related to the target distribution with characteristic function $\phi_\ell^{\Delta t}$. This means we should determine $\widetilde{X}_0$ implicitly by $F_0(\widetilde{X}_0) = U$, where F_0 is a CDF of a distribution similar to the target distribution, but which can be inverted efficiently.

5.2. **Approximation of a GH field.** We consider a GH Lévy field on the Hilbert space $H = L^2(\mathcal{D})$ with a compact spatial domain $\mathcal{D} \subset \mathbb{R}^s$. The operator Q on H is given by a *Matérn covariance operator* with variance $v > 0$, correlation length $r > 0$ and a positive parameter $\chi > 0$ defined by

$$(Qh)(x) := v \int_{\mathcal{D}} k_\chi(x,y)h(y)dy, \quad \text{for } h \in H,$$

where $\Gamma_G(\cdot)$ is the Gamma function. Since the spectral basis of this operator is not given in closed form, we approximate it by numerical quadrature of the covariance kernel. For a general overview of common covariance functions and the approximation of their eigenvalues we refer to [26] and the references therein. For $\chi = \frac{1}{2}$, we obtain the exponential covariance function and for $\chi \to \infty$ the squared exponential covariance function. For general $\chi > 0$, the *Matérn kernel*

$$k_\chi(x,y) := \frac{2^{1-\chi}}{\Gamma_G(\chi)} \Big(\frac{\sqrt{2\chi}|x-y|}{r} \Big)^\chi K_\chi \Big(\frac{\sqrt{2\chi}|x-y|}{r} \Big)$$

fulfills the limit identity $k_\chi(x,x) = \lim_{y \to x} = 1$, which can be easily seen by [23, Eq. (10.30.2)]. As shown in [15], this implies

$$tr(Q) = \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \rho_i = v \int_{\mathcal{D}} dx, \tag{5.1}$$

where $(\rho_i, i \in \mathbb{N})$ are the eigenvalues of the Matérn covariance function Q.
Now let L_N^{GH} be an approximation of a GH field by a N-dimensional GH process $(\ell^{GH_N}(t), t \in \mathbb{T})$ with fixed parameters $\lambda, \alpha, \delta \in \mathbb{R}$, $\beta, \mu \in \mathbb{R}^N$ and $\Gamma \in \mathbb{R}^{N \times N}$. The parameters are chosen in such a way that the multidimensional GH process has uncorrelated marginal processes, hence the generated KL expansions

$$L_N^{GH}(x)(t) = \sum_{i=1}^{N} \varphi_i(x) \ell_i^{GH}(t)$$

are again one-dimensional GH processes for any spectral basis $(\varphi_i, i \in \mathbb{N})$ and fixed $x \in \mathcal{D}$. This in turn means, that we may draw samples of ℓ^{GH_N} by simulating a GIG process ℓ^{GIG} with parameters $a = \delta, b = (\alpha^2 - \beta' \Gamma \beta)^{1/2}$ and $p = \lambda$ using Fourier inversion and then subordinating a N-dimensional Brownian motion (see Lemma 4.1). The characteristic function of a GIG Lévy process $(\ell^{GIG}(t), t \in \mathbb{T})$ with (fixed) parameters $a, b > 0$ and $p \in \mathbb{R}$ is given by

$$\phi_{GIG}(u; a, b, p) := \mathbb{E}[\exp(iu\ell^{GIG}(1))] = (1 - 2iub^{-2})^{-p/2} \frac{K_p(ab\sqrt{1 - 2iub^{-2}})}{K_p(ab)}. \tag{5.2}$$

The GIG distribution corresponding to $\phi_{GIG}^{\Delta t}$ with $\Delta t = 1$ is continuous with finite variance (see [29]), which implies that these properties hold for all distributions with characteristic function $\phi_{GIG}^{\Delta t}$, where $\Delta t > 0$ is an arbitrary positive exponent. The constants as in Assumption 3.2 are derived in the following. For $k \in \mathbb{N}$, the k-th moment of the GIG distribution is given as

$$0 < \mathbb{E}(\ell^{GIG}(1)^k) = \big(\frac{a}{b}\big)^k \frac{K_{p+k}(ab)}{K_p(ab)} < \infty.$$

For any $\eta = 2k$, therefore, we are able to calculate the bounding constant R via

$$R = (-1)^k \frac{d^{2k}}{du^{2k}} (\phi_{GIG}(u; a, b, p)^{\Delta t}) \big|_{u=0},$$

because the derivatives of ϕ_{GIG} at $u = 0$ are

$$\phi^{(k)}_{GIG}(0; a, b, p) = i^{-k}\mathbb{E}(\ell^{GIG}(1)^k) = i^{-k}\big(\frac{a}{b}\big)^k \frac{K_{p+k}(ab)}{K_p(ab)}.$$

The calculation of the η-th derivative can be implemented easily by using a version of Faà di Bruno's formula containing the Bell polynomials, for details we refer to [18]. The bounding constants θ and B may be determined numerically as described Section 5.1, e.g. by using the routine `fminsearch` in MatLab. The derivation of the bounds implies that we can ensure L^p convergence of the approximated GIG process in the sense of Corollary 3.16 for any $p \geq 1$, because it is possible to define η as any even integer and then obtain R by differentiation. We observe that the target distribution with characteristic function $\phi_{GIG}(u; a, b, p)^{\Delta t}$ and $\Delta t > 0$ is not necessarily GIG, except for the Inverse Gaussian (IG) case where $p = -1/2$ and $\phi_{IG}(u; a, b)^{\Delta t} = \phi_{IG}(u; \Delta t a, b)$(see Remark 4.3). This special feature of the IG distribution is exploited to determine the initial values $\widetilde{X}_0$ in the Newton iteration by moment matching: Consider an $IG(a_0, b_0)$ distribution with mean a_0/b_0 and variance a_0/b_0^3, where the parameters $a_0, b_0 > 0$ are "matched" to the target distribution's mean and variance via

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{a_0}{b_0} &= i\frac{d}{du}(\phi_{GIG}(u; a, b, p)^{\Delta t})\big|_{u=0},\\
\frac{a_0}{b_0^3} &= (-1)\frac{d^2}{du^2}(\phi_{GIG}(u; a, b, p)^{\Delta t})\big|_{u=0} - \Big(i\frac{d}{du}(\phi_{GIG}(u; a, b, p)^{\Delta t})\big|_{u=0}\Big)^2.
\end{aligned}$$

If F_{IG} denotes the CDF of this $IG(a_0, b_0)$ distribution, the initial value of the globalized Newton method is given implicitly by $F_{IG}(\widetilde{X}_0) = U$. The inversion of F_{IG} may be executed numerically by many software packages like MatLab.
With our approach, this results in the approximation of a GIG process $\widetilde{\ell}^{GIG}$ at discrete times $t_j = j\Delta t$ for $j = 0, \dots, n$. The N-dimensional GH process ℓ^{GH_N} may then be approximated at $(t_j, j = 0 \dots n)$ by the process $\widetilde{\ell}^{GH_N}$ with $\widetilde{\ell}^{GH_N}(t_0) = 0$ and the increments

$$\widetilde{\ell}^{GH_N}(t_j) - \widetilde{\ell}^{GH_N}(t_{j-1}) = \mu\Delta t + \Gamma\beta(\widetilde{\ell}^{GIG}(t_j) - \widetilde{\ell}^{GIG}(t_{j-1})) + \sqrt{(\widetilde{\ell}^{GIG}(t_j) - \widetilde{\ell}^{GIG}(t_{j-1}))\Gamma}W_j^N(1),$$

for $j = 1, \dots, n$, where the $W_j^N(1)$ are i.i.d. $\mathcal{N}_N(0, \mathbf{1}_{N\times N})$-distributed random vectors. To obtain the process $\widetilde{\ell}^{GH_N}$ at arbitrary times $t \in \mathbb{T}$, we interpolate the samples $(\widetilde{\ell}^{GH_N}(t_j), j = 0 \dots, n)$ piecewise constant as in Algorithm 3.7. With this, we are now able to generate an approximation of L_N^{GH} at any point $(x, t) \in \mathcal{D} \times \mathbb{T}$ by

$$\widetilde{L}_N^{GH}(x)(t) := \sum_{i=1}^{N} \varphi_i(x)\widetilde{\ell}_i^{GH}(t).$$

The knowledge of $tr(Q)$ now enables us to determine the truncation index N and the constant C_ℓ as in Remark 2.4: For $N \in \mathbb{N}$ let $(\widetilde{\ell}_i^{GH}, i = 1, \dots, N)$ be the approximations of the processes $(\ell_i^{GH}, i = 1, \dots, N)$, where the random vector $(\ell_1^{GH}(1), \dots, \ell_N^{GH}(1))$ is multivariate GH-distributed by assumption. Hence, for every $N \in \mathbb{N}$, we obtain the parameters of a corresponding GIG subordinator ℓ_N^{GIG}, which is approximated through a piecewise constant process $\widetilde{\ell}_N^{GIG}$ as above. With Eq. (3.4) for $p = 2$ and $p = 1$ we calculate

$$E^2_{GIG,N} := \sup_{t\in\mathbb{T}} \mathbb{E}(|\ell_N^{GIG}(t) - \widetilde{\ell}_N^{GIG}(t)|^2) \quad \text{and} \quad E^1_{GIG,N} := \sup_{t\in\mathbb{T}} \mathbb{E}(|\ell_N^{GIG}(t) - \widetilde{\ell}_N^{GIG}(t)|). \tag{5.3}$$

If $\beta \in \mathbb{R}^N$ and $\Gamma \in \mathbb{R}^{N\times N}$ denote the GH parameters corresponding to $(\ell_1^{GH}(1), \dots, \ell_N^{GH}(1))$, the $L^2(\Omega;\mathbb{R})$ approximation error of each process ℓ_i^{GH}, for $i = 1, \dots, N$, is given by

$$\widetilde{C}_{\ell,i} := \sup_{t\in\mathbb{T}} \frac{\mathbb{E}(|\ell_i^{GH}(t) - \widetilde{\ell}_i^{GH}(t)|^2)}{\Delta t} = \frac{E^2_{GIG,N}(\Gamma\beta)_i^2 + E^1_{GIG,N}}{\Delta t}.$$

Starting with $N = 1$, we compute the first N eigenvalues and the difference

$$T\Big(tr(Q) - \sum_{i=1}^{N} \rho_i\Big) - \max_{i=1,\dots,N} \widetilde{C}_{\ell,i}\Delta t \sum_{i=1}^{N} \rho_i$$

and increase N by one in every step until this expression is close to zero. If a suitable N is found, we define $C_\ell := \max_{i=1,\dots,N} \widetilde{C}_{\ell,i}$ and thus have equilibrated truncation and approximation errors by ensuring Eq. (2.4). For simplicity, we have implicitly assumed here that the processes ℓ_i^{GH} were normalized in the sense that $\mathrm{Var}(\ell_i^{GH}(t)) = t$. This is due to the fact that $\rho_i\ell_i$ (here with $\ell_i = \ell_i^{GH}$) in Theorem 2.3 represents the scalar product $(L(t), e_i)_H$ with variance $\rho_i t$. In case we have unnormalized processes, one can simply divide ℓ_i^{GH} by its standard deviation (see Formula (4.9)) and adjust the constants $\widetilde{C}_{\ell,i}$ and C_ℓ accordingly.

5.3. **Numerical results.** As a test for our algorithm, we generate GH fields on the time interval $\mathbb{T} = [0, 1]$ with step size $\Delta t = 2^{-6}$ and on the spatial domain $\mathcal{D} = [0, 1]$. For practical aspects, one is usually interested in the L^1-error $\mathbb{E}(|\ell(t) - \widetilde{\ell}(t)|)$ and the L^2-error $(\mathbb{E}(|\ell(t) - \widetilde{\ell}(t)|^2))^{1/2}$. Upper bounds for both expressions depend on η and D and are given by Ineq. (3.4). To obtain reasonable errors, we refer to the discussion on the choice of D in Remark 3.17 and set $D = \Delta t^{1/(1-\eta)}$. This ensures that the L^1-error is of order $\mathcal{O}(\Delta t)$ and is a good trade-off between simulation time and the size of the L^2-error for most values of η in the GIG example below. Choosing for example $D = \Delta t^{2/(2-\eta)}$ would reduce the L^2-error to order $\mathcal{O}(\Delta t)$, but does not have a significant effect on the L^1-error and results in a higher computational time. For the Matérn covariance operator Q we use variance $v = 1$, correlation length $r = 0.1$ and $\chi \in \{\frac{1}{2}, \frac{3}{2}\}$, where a higher value of χ increases the regularity of the field along the x-direction. For the fixed GH parameters we choose $\alpha = 5$, $\beta = \mu = 0_N$, $\delta = 4$ and $\Gamma = \mathbf{1}_N$, the shape parameter λ will vary throughout our simulation and admits the values $\lambda \in \{-\frac{1}{2}, 1\}$, which results in NIG resp. hyperbolic GH fields. This parameter setting ensures that the multidimensional GH distribution has uncorrelated marginals, hence the truncated KL expansion L_N^{GH} of L^{GH} is itself a N-dimensional GH Lévy process. Further, for every $N \in \mathbb{N}$, the constant $\widetilde{C}_{\ell,i}$ from Section 5.2 is independent of $i = 1, \dots, N$, thus the truncation index N can easily be determined to balance out the Fourier inversion and truncation error for each combination of λ and χ. To examine the impact of η on the efficiency of the simulation, we set $\eta \in \{4, 6, 8, 10\}$ and the constant R as suggested in Section 5.2 for each η. For fixed η and R, we choose $\theta \in \{1, 1.5 \dots, 99.5, 100\}$ and calculate for each θ the constant B_θ as in Section 5.1. This results in up to 199 different values for the number of summations M_θ, which all guarantee the desired accuracy ε, meaning we can choose the smallest M for our simulation. We generate 1.000 approximations $\widetilde{L}_N^{GH}$ for several combinations of λ, χ and η below, which allows us to check if the generated samples actually follow the desired target distributions. To this end, we conduct Kolomogorov-Smirnov tests for the subordinating GIG process as well as for the distribution of the GH field at a fixed point in time and space and report on the corresponding p-values.


Approximation of a GH random field with KL expansion
Value of the generalized hyperbolic field
Time axis t
Space axis x
1000 generated samples of the GH field L_N(x)(t) at t=1 and x=1
Generated samples
Target GH density
Relative frequencies
Realized values

(a) Sample of a GH field (b) Empirical dist. of 1.000 samples at $t = x = 1$

Figure 1 Sample and empirical distribution of an hyperbolic field with parameters $\lambda = 1$, $\chi = 1/2$, $\eta = 10$ and truncation after $N = 132$ terms.


Approximation of a GH random field with KL expansion
Value of the generalized hyperbolic field
Time axis t
Space axis x
1000 generated samples of the GH field L_N(x)(t) at t=1 and x=1
Generated samples
Target GH density
Relative frequencies
Realized values

(a) Sample of a GH field (b) Empirical dist. of 1.000 samples at $t = x = 1$

Figure 2 Sample and empirical distribution of a NIG field with parameters $\lambda = -1/2$, $\chi = 3/2$, $\eta = 10$ and truncation after $N = 18$ terms.

Figures 1 and 2 show samples of approximated GH random fields: Along the time axis we see the characteristic behavior of the (pure jump) GH processes for every point $x \in \mathcal{D}$. For a fixed point in time t, the paths along the x-axis vary according to their correlation, depending on the covariance parameter χ. As reported in [26], the eigenvalues of Q decay slower if χ becomes smaller, meaning we need a higher number of summations N in the KL expansion so that the error contributions are equilibrated. This effect can be seen in Tables 1 and 2, where the truncation index N changes significantly with χ. If the KL expansion, however, can be sampled by a N-dimensional GH process as suggested in Theorem 4.10, the number of summations N has only a minor impact on the computational costs of the KL expansion. This is due to the fact that in this case the time consuming part, namely simulating the subordinator, has to be done only once, regardless of the amount of N. Compared to these costs, the costs of subordinating a Brownian motion of any finite dimension are negligible.

η	$\mathbb{E}^1_{GIG,N}$	$\mathbb{E}^1_{GIG,N}/\Delta t$	$\mathbb{E}^2_{GIG,N}$	$\mathbb{E}^2_{GIG,N}/\Delta t$	p-value GIG
4	0.0140	0.8956	0.2025	12.9600	0.5498
6	0.0137	0.8745	0.0440	2.8137	0.5498
8	0.0137	0.8737	0.0332	2.1224	0.5498
10	0.0138	0.8828	0.0463	2.9660	0.5498
η	N	$\mathbb{E}[\|\|L^{GH}(1) - \widetilde{L}^{GH}_N(1)\|\|^2_H]$	p-value GH	abs. time	rel. time
4	130	0.0639	0.8246	0.1945 sec.	100.00%
6	133	0.0624	0.3077	0.1093 sec.	56.19%
8	133	0.0624	0.3077	0.0851 sec.	43.78%
10	132	0.0630	0.2873	0.0759 sec.	39.04%

Table 1 The p-values and average simulation times per field based on 1.000 simulations. Stepsize $\Delta t = 2^{-6}$ and $D = \Delta t^{1/(1-\eta)}$. GH process: $\lambda = 1$, $\alpha = 5, \beta = 0_N$, $\delta = 4, \mu = 0_N, \Gamma = 1_{N\times N}$. Covariance parameters: $\chi = 1/2$, $r = 0.1$ and $v = 1$.

η	$\mathbb{E}^1_{GIG,N}$	$\mathbb{E}^1_{GIG,N}/\Delta t$	$\mathbb{E}^2_{GIG,N}$	$\mathbb{E}^2_{GIG,N}/\Delta t$	p-value GIG
4	0.0129	0.8277	0.1616	10.3440	0.6145
6	0.0127	0.8103	0.0336	2.1509	0.6145
8	0.0126	0.8093	0.0245	1.5665	0.6145
10	0.0127	0.8151	0.0329	2.1065	0.6145
η	N	$\mathbb{E}[\|\|L^{GH}(1) - \widetilde{L}^{GH}_N(1)\|\|^2_H]$	p-value GH	abs. time	rel. time
4	18	0.0610	0.9223	0.1039 sec.	100.00%
6	18	0.0603	0.9223	0.0628 sec.	60.43%
8	18	0.0603	0.9223	0.0460 sec.	44.29%
10	18	0.0605	0.9223	0.0380 sec.	38.59%

Table 2 The p-values and average simulation times per field based on 1.000 simulations. Stepsize $\Delta t = 2^{-6}$ and $D = \Delta t^{1/(1-\eta)}$. GH process: $\lambda = -1/2$, $\alpha = 5, \beta = 0_N$, $\delta = 4, \mu = 0_N, \Gamma = 1_{N\times N}$. Covariance parameters: $\chi = 3/2$, $r = 0.1$ and $v = 1$.

The histograms in Figures 1 and 2 show the empirical distribution of the approximation $\widetilde{L}^{GH}_N(x)(t)$ at time $t = 1$ and $x = 1$. The theoretical distribution at time 1 and an arbitrary point $x \in \mathcal{D}$ is again GH, where the parameters are given in Lemma 4.9. Obviously, the empirical distributions fit the target GH distributions from Lemma 4.9. To be more precise, we have conducted a Kolmogorov-Smirnov test for both, the subordinating GIG process and the GH field at time $t = 1$ and for the latter at $x = 1$. We know the law of both processes at $x \in \mathcal{D}$ and are able to obtain their CDFs sufficiently precise for the tests by numerical integration. The test results for 1.000 samples of the hyperbolic resp. the NIG field with covariance parameters $\chi = \frac{1}{2}$ resp. $\chi = \frac{3}{2}$ are given in Tables 1 and 2 above and do not suggest that the generated samples follow another distribution than the expected one. We denote by $E^1_{GIG,N}$ and $E^2_{GIG,N}$ the approximation error of the subordinator as in Eq. (5.3), which we have listed in absolute terms and relative to Δt in Tables 1 and 2. While the $L^1(\Omega;\mathbb{R})$-error $E^1_{GIG,N}$ is relatively constant for each η, the $L^2(\Omega;\mathbb{R})$-error $E^2_{GIG,N}$ is rather high for $\eta = 4$, but has an acceptable upper bound for $\eta \geq 6$. This is not surprising, since $D = \Delta t^{1/(1-\eta)}$ only guarantees that $\mathbb{E}(|\ell_G(t) - \widetilde{\ell}_G(t)|) = \mathcal{O}(\Delta t)$. The truncation index N is highly sensitive to χ, but has small or no variations for fixed χ and varying η. Since we choose $t \in [0, 1]$, the expression $\mathbb{E}(||L^{GH}(1) - \widetilde{L}^{GH}_N(1)||^2_H)$ in Tables 1 and 2 is an upper bound for

the $L^2(\Omega;H)$-error $\sup_{t\in[0,1]}\mathbb{E}(||L^{GH}(t)-\widetilde{L}_N^{GH}(t)||_H^2)$. Note that this error is small in relative terms, since by our choice of Q and Eq. 5.1 we have $\mathbb{E}(||L^{GH}(1)||_H^2)=tr(Q)=1$.

The p-value of the GH distribution varies if different N are chosen for the KL expansion, which is natural due to statistical fluctuations. More importantly, the null hypothesis, namely that the samples follow a GH distribution with the expected parameters, is never rejected at a 5%-level. As expected, the speed of the simulation heavily depends on η.

Looking at the results for $\eta=4$, one might argue that the Fourier inversion method is only suitable for processes where this parameter can be chosen rather high, i.e. for distributions which admit a large number of finite moments. To qualify this objection, we consider once more the t-distribution with three degrees of freedom and the corresponding Lévy process ℓ_{t3} from Example 3.13. Since $\mathbb{E}(\ell_{t3}(\Delta t))=0$ and $\mathrm{Var}(\ell_{t3}(\Delta t))=\sqrt{3}\Delta t$, we can choose $\eta=2$ and hence $R=\sqrt{3}\Delta t$. The characteristic function is given by

$$\phi_{t3}(u)^{\Delta t}=\exp(-\sqrt{3}\Delta t|u|)(\sqrt{3}|u|+1)^{\Delta t}$$

and B and θ are estimated in the same way as for the GIG process. Using again $\Delta t=2^{-6}$ and $D=\Delta t^{1/(1-\eta)}$, we obtain that the number of summations in the approximation is $M=12.924$ for $\theta=\frac{19}{2}$. The simulation time of one process $\widetilde{\ell}_{t3}$ in the interval $[0,1]$ is on average 0.0655 seconds, where the initial values have been approximated by matching the moments of a normal distribution (the Kolmogorov-Smirnov test for a t-distribution at $t=1$ based on 1.000 samples returns a p-value of 0.5994). In the GIG example, we needed $M=79.086$ summations if $\eta=4$ and still the amount of $M=33.030$ summations for $\eta=10$. This shows that the Fourier Inversion method is also applicable if η can only be chosen relatively low and that the GIG (resp. GH) process is a computationally expensive example of a Lévy process.

References

[1] S. Asmussen and J. Rosiński, *Approximations of small jumps of lévy processes with a view towards simulation*, Journal of Applied Probability, 38 (2001), pp. 482–493.

[2] O. E. Barndorff-Nielsen, *Exponentially decreasing distributions for the logarithm of particle size*, Proceedings of the Royal Society of London. Series A, Mathematical and Physical Sciences, 353 (1977), pp. 401–419.

[3] ———, *Hyperbolic distributions and distributions on hyperbolae*, Scandinavian Journal of Statistics, 5 (1978), pp. 151–157.

[4] O. E. Barndorff-Nielsen and C. Halgreen, *Infinite divisibility of the hyperbolic and generalized inverse Gaussian distributions*, Zeitschrift für Wahrscheinlichkeitstheorie und Verwandte Gebiete, 38, pp. 309–311.

[5] O. E. Barndorff-Nielsen, J. Kent, and M. Sørensen, *Normal variance-mean mixtures and z distributions*, International Statistical Review / Revue Internationale de Statistique, 50 (1982), pp. 145–159.

[6] O. E. Barndorff-Nielsen, T. Mikosch, and S. I. Resnick, *Lévy Processes: Theory and Applications*, Springer Science & Business Media, 2012.

[7] A. Barth and F. E. Benth, *The forward dynamics in energy markets–infinite-dimensional modelling and simulation*, Stochastics An International Journal of Probability and Stochastic Processes, 86 (2014), pp. 932–966.

[8] A. Barth and A. Lang, *Milstein approximation for advection-diffusion equations driven by multiplicative noncontinuous martingale noises*, Appl. Math. Optim., 66 (2012), pp. 387–413.

[9] ———, *Simulation of stochastic partial differential equations using finite element methods*, Stochastics, 84 (2012), pp. 217–231.

[10] P. Blæsild, *The two-dimensional hyperbolic distribution and related distributions, with an application to Johannsen's bean data*, Biometrika, 68 (1981), pp. 251–263.

[11] P. Blaesild and J. L. Jensen, *Multivariate Distributions of Hyperbolic Type*, Springer Netherlands, Dordrecht, 1981, pp. 45–66.
[12] A. Cherny and A. Shiryaev, *Change of Time and Measure for Lévy Processes*, Lectures for the Summer School "From Lévy Processes to Semimartingales - Recent Theoretical Developments and Applications to Finance", (2002).
[13] E. Eberlein, *Lévy Processes: Theory and Applications*, Birkhäuser Boston, Boston, MA, 2001, ch. Application of Generalized Hyperbolic Lévy Motions to Finance, pp. 319–336.
[14] E. Eberlein and U. Keller, *Hyperbolic distributions in finance*, Bernoulli, 1 (1995), pp. 281–299.
[15] O. G. Ernst, C. E. Powell, D. J. Silvester, and E. Ullmann, *Efficient solvers for a linear stochastic Galerkin mixed formulation of diffusion problems with random data*, SIAM Journal on Scientific Computing, 31 (2009), pp. 1424–1447.
[16] J. Gil-Pelaez, *Note on the inversion theorem*, Biometrika, 38 (1951), pp. 481–482.
[17] P. Hughett, *Error bounds for numerical inversion of a probability characteristic function*, SIAM Journal on Numerical Analysis, 35 (1998), pp. 1368–1392.
[18] W. P. Johnson, *The curious history of Faà di Bruno's formula*, The American Mathematical Monthly, 109 (2002), pp. 217–234.
[19] D. Kelker, *Infinite divisibility and variance mixtures of the normal distribution*, The Annals of Mathematical Statistics, 42 (1971), pp. 802–808.
[20] H. Masuda, *On multidimensional Ornstein-Uhlenbeck processes driven by a general Lévy process*, Bernoulli, 10 (2004), pp. 97–120.
[21] J. Nocedal and S. Wright, *Numerical Optimization*, Springer Science & Business Media, 2006.
[22] T. A. Øigård, A. Hanssen, and R. E. Hansen, *The multivariate Normal Inverse Gaussian distribution: EM-estimation and analysis of synthetic aperture sonar data*, in Signal Processing Conference, 2004 12th European, Sept 2004, pp. 1433–1436.
[23] F. W. Olver, *NIST Handbook of Mathematical Functions*, Cambridge University Press, 2010.
[24] S. Peszat and J. Zabczyk, *Stochastic Partial Differential Equations with Lévy Noise*, vol. 113 of Encyclopedia of Mathematics and its Applications, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2007.
[25] W. H. Press, S. A. Teukolsky, W. T. Vetterling, and B. P. Flannery, *Numerical Recipes in C*, vol. 2, Cambridge university press Cambridge, 1996.
[26] C. E. Rasmussen and C. K. Williams, *Gaussian processes for Machine Learning*, the MIT Press, 2 (2006), p. 4.
[27] T. H. Rydberg, *The normal inverse Gaussian Lévy process: simulation and approximation*, Comm. Statist. Stochastic Models, 13 (1997), pp. 887–910. Heavy tails and highly volatile phenomena.
[28] K. Sato, *Lévy Processes and Infinite Divisibility*, Cambridge University Press Cambridge, 1999.
[29] W. Schoutens, *Lévy Processes in Finance: Pricing Financial Derivatives*, John Wiley and Sons, 2003.
[30] D. Zhang and Q. Kang, *Pore scale simulation of solute transport in fractured porous media*, Geophysical Research Letters, 31 (2004). L12504.

(Andrea Barth)
SimTech, University of Stuttgart
Pfaffenwaldring 5a
70569 Stuttgart, Germany
E-mail address: andrea.barth@mathematik.uni-stuttgart.de

(Andreas Stein)
SimTech, University of Stuttgart
Pfaffenwaldring 5a
70569 Stuttgart, Germany
E-mail address: andreas.stein@mathematik.uni-stuttgart.de